arXiv:1703.02680v1 [math.PR] 8 Mar 2017

A large deviation principle for empirical measures on Polish spaces: Application to singular Gibbs measures on manifolds

David García Zelada

March 9, 2017

Abstract

We prove a large deviation principle for a sequence of point processes defined by Gibbs probability measures on a Polish space. This is obtained as a consequence of a more general Laplace principle for the nonnormalized Gibbs measures. We consider three main applications: Conditional Gibbs measures on compact spaces, Coulomb gases on compact Riemannian manifolds and the usual Gibbs measures in the Euclidean space. Finally, we study the generalization of Fekete points and prove the convergence of the empirical measures to the minimizer of the energy if it is unique. The approach is partly inspired by the works of Dupuis and co-authors. It is remarkably natural and general compared to the usual strategies for singular Gibbs measures.

Keywords: Gibbs measure; Coulomb gas; empirical measure; large deviation principle; interacting particle system; singular potential; two-dimensional Einstein manifold; relative entropy; Fekete points.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 60F10; 60K35; 82C22.

1 Introduction

The present article is inspired by part of the work of Dupuis, Laschos and Ramanan on large deviations for a sequence of point processes given by Gibbs measures associated to very general singular two-body interactions [12]. In fact, we follow the philosophy of Dupuis and Ellis [11] about the use of variational formulas to make plausible and sometimes easier to find a Laplace principle.

We are interested in proving the Laplace principle and the large deviation principle for a very general sequence of energies in a not necessarily compact space. Part of our work has an overlap with the article of Berman [6] and it was developed independently. As in [6] the peculiarity of this result is the generality of the sequence of energies: they do not need to be made of a two-body interaction potential but they may still be very singular. The proof given here is very simple compared to the ad hoc methods used in the usual proofs of the large deviation principles for a sequence of Gibbs measures such as in [3], [14], [15] [9] and [13]. It can be seen as a generalization of the Laplace-Varadhan lemma for the Sanov's theorem to the case of more singular functions that may depend on n (Section 6).

Among the applications we can give we are particularly interested in explaining a simple case inspired by [5]. This is the case of a Coulomb gas on a two-dimensional Riemannian manifold. As a second application we study a large deviation principle for a conditional Gibbs measure, i.e. we fix the position of some of the particles and leave the rest of them random. The last application we discuss is a different proof of already known results such as the one-dimensional log-gas of [1, Section 2.6], the special two-dimensional log-gas [3] related to the Ginibre ensemble of random matrices and its generalization to an n-dimensional Coulomb gas in [9] and [12], and the note in [13] about two-dimensional log-gases with a weakly confining potential.

We now explain the contents of each section. The rest of Section 1 will be dedicated to the main definitions and assumptions we will need to state the theorems. The two main theorems will be stated and we will discuss some properties about the assumptions. Those properties are used in the examples and applications mainly for simplification. Section 2 includes the most famous example, the k-body interaction. We give sufficient conditions to satisfy the hypothesis and these will be important when we treat the Euclidean space case. In Section 3 we start giving an idea of the proofs. This includes mainly the variational formula we talked about above and some properties of the entropy. Then we give the proofs of the two main theorems and of their corollaries. We discuss some particular examples in Section 4. More precisely, the conditional Gibbs measure, the Coulomb gas on a Riemannian manifold and a new way to obtain already known results in the Euclidean space. Section 5 is about the nonrandom case, also known sometimes as Fekete points. We give an easy proof for the convergence of the empirical measure of minimizers of the energy by using the same hypothesis as in the random case. The relation to the generalized Laplace-Varadhan lemma is given in Section 6. Finally, we have four appendices where we prove some known results for the reader's convenience.

1.1 Model

Let M be a Polish space, i.e. a separable topological space such that there exists a complete metric that induces its topology. Choose a probability measure π on M. We say that (M, π) is a Polish probability space. Denote by $\mathcal{P}(M)$ the space of probability measures in M and endow it with the topology of weak convergence of probability measures, also known as vague convergence (see Appendix A for definitions).
Suppose we have a sequence $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of symmetric measurable functions

$$W_n : M^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$$

and a measurable function

$$W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty].$$

Along the article our sequences will be indexed by $\mathbb{N}$. Nevertheless they will make sense for n large enough. In fact, we may consider W_n not defined for every n but just for an increasing sequence of positive integers and the results will always be true with the obvious changes.

Stable sequence. *We shall say that the sequence $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a* **stable sequence** *if it is uniformly bounded from below, i.e. if there exists $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$W_n \geq C \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Take a sequence of nonnegative numbers $\{\beta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that converges to some $\beta \in (0, \infty]$. We define the **Gibbs measures** (not normalized)

$$d\gamma_n = e^{-n\beta_n W_n} d\pi^{\otimes_n} \tag{1.1}$$

and the **free energy** with parameter β as

$$F = W + \frac{1}{\beta} D(\cdot\|\pi), \tag{1.2}$$

(we suppose $0 \times \infty = 0$) where $D(\mu\|\nu)$ denotes the relative entropy of μ with respect to ν, also known as the Kullback–Leibler divergence i.e.

$$D(\mu\|\nu) = \int_M \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \log\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}\right) d\nu \tag{1.3}$$

if μ is absolutely continuous with respect to ν and $D(\mu\|\nu) = \infty$ otherwise.

We shall state the main assumptions we will make in the theorems.

Lower limit assumption (H1). *Define the 'extension' of W_n to $\mathcal{P}(M)$ as*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}_n : \mathcal{P}(M) &\to (-\infty, \infty] \\ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{x_i} &\mapsto W_n(x_1, ..., x_n) \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

and ∞ otherwise. We say that the pair $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the lower lower limit assumption (H1) if for every sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures on M that converges to some probability measure μ we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \tilde{W}_n(\mu_n) \geq W(\mu).$$

Upper limit assumption (H2). *We say that the pair $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the upper limit assumption (H2) if for each $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ we have that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n] \leq W(\mu).$$

Regularity assumption (H3). *Define the set of 'nice' probability measures*

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(M) : \ D(\mu\|\pi) < \infty \text{ and } \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n] \leq W(\mu) \right\}. \tag{1.5}$$

We shall say that the pair $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the regularity assumption (H3) if for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $W(\mu) < \infty$ we can find a sequence of probability measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{N}$ such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $\limsup_{n\to\infty} W(\mu_n) \leq W(\mu)$.

Notice that if the *upper limit assumption* (H2) is satisfied then the *regularity assumption* (H3) depends only on W and not on the sequence $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Confining assumption (H4). *We shall say that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4) if the following is true. Let $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be any increasing sequence of natural numbers and let $\{\mu_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be any sequence of probability measures on M. If there exists a real constant A such that*

$$\tilde{W}_{n_j}(\mu_j) \leq A$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\tilde{W}_n$ is defined in 1.4, then $\{\mu_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{P}(M)$.

The previous condition is always true in a compact space. Now we can state the Laplace principles and the large deviation principles.

1.2 Main results

Denote by

$$\begin{aligned} i_n : M^n &\to \mathcal{P}(M) \\ (x_1, ..., x_n) &\mapsto \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{x_i} \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

the usual continuous 'inclusion' of M^n in $\mathcal{P}(M)$. The following is the first main theorem. This treats the case where β is finite.

Theorem 1.1 (Laplace principle for finite β)**.** *Let $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a stable sequence and $W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$ a measurable function such that $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the lower and upper limit assumptions, (H1) and (H2). Take a sequence of positive numbers $\{\beta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that converges to some $\beta \in (0, \infty)$. Define the Gibbs measures γ_n by 1.1 and the free energy F by 1.2. Then, the following Laplace's principle is satisfied.*

For every bounded continuous function $f : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-n\beta_n f\circ i_n} d\gamma_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} - \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + F(\mu)\}.$$

This Laplace principle implies the following large deviation principle.

Corollary 1.2 (Large deviation principle for finite β)**.** *Define $Z_n = \gamma_n(M^n)$. Suppose $Z_n > 0$ for every n. As the sequence $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a stable sequence we also have $Z_n < \infty$ for every n. Take the sequence of probability measures $\{\mathbb{P}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by*

$$d\mathbb{P}_n = \frac{1}{Z_n} d\gamma_n. \tag{1.7}$$

Suppose the same conditions as in Theorem 1.1. Additionally, suppose W is lower semicontinuous, i.e. $\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M) : W(\mu) \le a\}$ is closed for every $a < \infty$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $i_n(\mathbb{P}_n)$ be the pushforward measure of $\mathbb{P}_n$ by i_n. Then the sequence $\{i_n(\mathbb{P}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with speed $n\beta_n$ and with rate function

$$I = F - \inf F,$$

i.e. for every open set $A \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$ we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \mathbb{P}_n(i_n^{-1}(A)) \ge - \inf_{\mu\in A} I(\mu)$$

and for every closed set $C \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$ we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \mathbb{P}_n(i_n^{-1}(C)) \le - \inf_{\mu\in C} I(\mu).$$

The second main theorem is the following. It is the case of infinite β.

Theorem 1.3 (Laplace principle for infinite β)**.** *Let $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a stable sequence and $W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$ a measurable function. Suppose $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the lower limit assumption (H1) and the regularity assumption (H3) and suppose $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4). Take a sequence of positive numbers $\{\beta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that converges to infinity, i.e. $\beta = \infty$. Define the Gibbs measures γ_n by 1.1 and the free energy F by 1.2. Then, the following Laplace's principle is satisfied.*

For every continuous function $f : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-n\beta_n f\circ i_n} d\gamma_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} - \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + F(\mu)\}.$$

Corollary 1.4 (Large deviation principle for infinite β)**.** *Define $Z_n = \gamma_n(M^n)$. Suppose $Z_n > 0$ for every n. As the sequence $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a stable sequence we also have $Z_n < \infty$ for every n. Take the sequence of probability measures $\{\mathbb{P}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by*

$$d\mathbb{P}_n = \frac{1}{Z_n} d\gamma_n. \tag{1.8}$$

Suppose the same conditions as in Theorem 1.3. Additionally, suppose W has compact level sets, i.e. $\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M) : W(\mu) \leq a\}$ is compact for every $a < \infty$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $i_n(\mathbb{P}_n)$ be the pushforward measure of $\mathbb{P}_n$ by i_n. Then, the sequence $\{i_n(\mathbb{P}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with speed $n\beta_n$ and with rate function

$$I = F - \inf F,$$

i.e. for every open set $A \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$ we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \mathbb{P}_n(i_n^{-1}(A)) \geq - \inf_{\mu\in A} I(\mu)$$

and for every closed set $C \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$ we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \mathbb{P}_n(i_n^{-1}(C)) \leq - \inf_{\mu\in C} I(\mu).$$

In Section 2 we shall study the usual case of k-body interaction. We will see when the associated sequence satisfy the assumptions. Section 4 will be about some more specific examples, such as the conditional Gibbs measure, the Coulomb gas on a compact Riemannian manifold and the usual Gibbs measures on a noncompact space such as the Euclidean space. But first we need to make some remarks about the assumptions.

1.3 Comments about the assumptions

In this section we are going to mention some properties of the assumptions. These will help us simplify many proofs in the applications.

The first one is just a reformulation of the *lower limit assumption* (H1) using W instead of $\tilde{W}$.

Remark 1.5 (Equivalent lower limit assumption)**.** *The lower limit assumption (H1) is equivalent to the following. For every increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a sequence $\{a_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ where $a_j \in M^{n_j}$ such that*

$$i_{n_j}(a_j) \xrightarrow[j\to\infty]{} \mu$$

for some $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ we have

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} W_{n_j}(a_j) \geq W(\mu).$$

The following remarks tell us that any positive linear combination of stable sequences that satisfy the *lower* or *upper limit assumption*, (H1) or (H2), satisfies the *lower* or *upper limit assumption*, (H1) or (H2).

Remark 1.6 (Closure by scalar multiplication)**.** *If $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of nonnegative numbers that converge to some $a \in (0, \infty)$ and $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the lower limit assumption (H1) then $(\{a_n W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, aW)$ also satisfies the lower limit assumption (H1). The same is true if we change lower limit assumption (H1) by upper limit assumption (H2).*

Remark 1.7 (Closure by sum)**.** *If $(\{W_n^1\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W^1)$ and $(\{W_n^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W^2)$ satisfy the lower limit assumption (H1) then $(\{W_n^1 + W_n^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W^1 + W^2)$ satisfy the lower limit assumption (H1). The same is true if we change lower limit assumption (H1) by upper limit assumption (H2).*

The following two remarks are related to the *confining assumption* (H4). The first one may be used to simplify proofs and the second remark is important when we treat the usual cases in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Remark 1.8 (Confining assumption is preserved under affine transformations)**.** *If $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4), $\{b_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of real numbers such that $b_n \to b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of nonnegative numbers such that $a_n \to a > 0$ then the sequence $\{a_n W_n + b_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4).*

Remark 1.9 (Confining assumption of a perturbed sequence)**.** *Let $\{W_n^1\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{W_n^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be two stable sequences. Let $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of nonnegative numbers such that $a_n \to 1$. If $\{W_n^1 + W_n^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4) then $\{W_n^1 + a_n W_n^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4).*

Proof. By Remark 1.8 and because the sequences are uniformly bounded from below we can assume W_n^1 and W_n^2 positive. Let $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an increasing sequence of natural numbers and $\{\mu_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of probability measures such that

$$\tilde{W}^1_{n_j}(\mu_j) + a_{n_j}\tilde{W}^2_{n_j}(\mu_j) \leq A$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and some real number A, where $\tilde{W}_n$ is defined in 1.4. Then

$$\tilde{W}^1_{n_j}(\mu_j) \leq A$$

and

$$a_{n_j}\tilde{W}^2_{n_j}(\mu_j) \leq A.$$

But, if j is large enough, we have $a_{n_j} \geq 1/2$. So,

$$\tilde{W}^2_{n_j}(\mu_j) \leq 2A$$

and we get

$$\tilde{W}^1_{n_j}(\mu_j) + \tilde{W}^2_{n_j}(\mu_j) \leq 3A$$

for j large enough. Then $\{\mu_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight. □

2 Example of a stable sequence: k-body interaction

We will give the most basic nontrivial example of a stable sequence. We start with a simple case, the more general case being a straightforward generalization.

Lemma 2.1 (Two-body interaction)**.** *Take a symmetric lower semicontinuous function bounded from below $G : M \times M \to (-\infty, \infty]$. Define*

$$W_n : M^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$$

$$(x_1, ..., x_n) \mapsto \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}^{n} G(x_i, x_j)$$

and

$$W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$$

$$\mu \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G(x, y)\, d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

Then $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a stable sequence, i.e. measurable and uniformly bounded from below, W is lower semicontinuous and the pair $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the lower and upper limit assumption, (H1) and (H2).

Proof. To see that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a stable sequence we notice that if $C \le G$ then $\frac{n(n-1)}{2n^2}C \le W_n$. The lower semicontinuity of W is a consequence of the lower semicontinuity of G and the fact that it is bounded from below. Now, let us prove that $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the *lower and upper limit assumption*, (H1) and (H2).

• **Lower limit assumption (H1).** Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. Take $N > 0$ and define $G_N = G \wedge N$. Then, we can prove that

$$\tilde{W}_n(\mu) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{N}{n} \ge \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G_N(x,y)\, d\mu(x)d\mu(y) \tag{2.1}$$

where $\tilde{W}_n$ is the extension defined in 1.4. If $\tilde{W}_n(\mu) = \infty$ there is nothing to prove. If $\tilde{W}_n(\mu) < \infty$ then $\mu = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$ for some $(x_1, ..., x_n) \in M^n$. Then we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}^{n} G_N(x_i, x_j) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{N}{n} \ge \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G_N(x,y)\, d\mu(x)d\mu(y),$$

but

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}^{n} G(x_i, x_j) \ge \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}^{n} G_N(x_i, x_j),$$

and we get the inequality 2.1. Let $\mu_n \to \mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. Then, taking the lower limit as n goes to infinity in the inequality

$$\tilde{W}_n(\mu_n) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{N}{n} \ge \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G_N(x,y)\, d\mu_n(x)d\mu_n(y),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n\to\infty} \tilde{W}_n(\mu_n) &\ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G_N(x,y) d\mu_n(x)d\mu_n(y) \\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G_N(x,y) d\mu(x)d\mu(y),\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the lower semicontinuity of G_N and the fact that it is bounded from below. Finally, as G is bounded from below we can take N to infinity and use the monotone convergence theorem to get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \tilde{W}_n(\mu_n) \ge \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G(x,y) d\mu(x)d\mu(y).$$

• **Upper limit assumption (H2).** Take $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ and notice that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n] = \frac{n(n-1)}{2n^2}\int_{M\times M} G(x,y) d\mu(x)d\mu(y).$$

Then,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n] = \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G(x,y) d\mu(x)d\mu(y).$$

□

Lemma 2.2 (k-body interaction)**.** *A generalization of the previous example is to take an integer $k > 0$ and a symmetric lower semicontinuous function bounded from below $G : M^k \to (-\infty, \infty]$. Define*

$$W_n : M^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$$
$$(x_1, ..., x_n) \mapsto \frac{1}{n^k} \sum_{\substack{\{i_1,...,i_k\}\subset\{1,...,n\} \\ \#\{i_1,...,i_k\}=k}} G(x_{i_1}, ..., x_{i_k}).$$

and

$$W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$$
$$\mu \mapsto \frac{1}{k!} \int_{M^k} G(x_1, ..., x_k) d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_k).$$

Then $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a stable sequence, i.e. measurable and uniformly bounded from below, W is lower semicontinuous and the pair $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the lower and upper limit assumption, (H1) and (H2).

Proof. (We shall almost copy the same proof as the previous example.)

To see that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a stable sequence we notice that if $C \le G$ then $\binom{n}{k}\frac{1}{n^k}C \le W_n$. The lower semicontinuity of W is a consequence of the lower semicontinuity of G and the fact that it is bounded from below. Now, let us prove that $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the *lower and upper limit assumption*, (H1) and (H2).

• **Lower limit assumption (H1).** Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. As the previous example, take $N > 0$ and define $G_N = G \wedge N$. Then, we can prove that

$$\tilde{W}_n(\mu) + \frac{N}{k!\, n^k}\left(n^k - \frac{n!}{(n-k)!}\right) \ge \frac{1}{k!}\int_{M^k} G_N(x_1, ..., x_k) d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_k) \tag{2.2}$$

where $\tilde{W}_n$ is the extension defined in 1.4. If $\tilde{W}_n(\mu) = \infty$ there is nothing to prove. If $\tilde{W}_n(\mu) < \infty$ then $\mu = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$ for some $(x_1, ..., x_n) \in M^n$. Then we have

$$\frac{1}{n^k} \sum_{\substack{\{i_1,...,i_k\}\subset\{1,...,n\} \\ \#\{i_1,...,i_k\}=k}} G_N(x_{i_1}, ..., x_{i_k}) + \frac{N}{k!\, n^k}\left(n^k - \frac{n!}{(n-k)!}\right) \ge \frac{1}{k!}\int_{M^k} G_N(x_1, ..., x_k) d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_k),$$

but

$$\frac{1}{n^k} \sum_{\substack{\{i_1,...,i_k\}\subset\{1,...,n\} \\ \#\{i_1,...,i_k\}=k}} G(x_{i_1}, ..., x_{i_k}) \ge \frac{1}{n^k} \sum_{\substack{\{i_1,...,i_k\}\subset\{1,...,n\} \\ \#\{i_1,...,i_k\}=k}} G_N(x_{i_1}, ..., x_{i_k})$$

and we get the inequality 2.2. Let $\mu_n \to \mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. Then, taking the lower limit as n goes to infinity in the inequality

$$\tilde{W}_n(\mu_n) + \frac{N}{k!\, n^k}\left(n^k - \frac{n!}{(n-k)!}\right) \ge \frac{1}{k!}\int_{M^k} G_N(x_1, ..., x_k) d\mu_n(x_1)...d\mu_n(x_k),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n\to\infty} \tilde{W}_n(\mu_n) &\ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{k!}\int_{M^k} G_N(x_1, ..., x_k) d\mu_n(x_1)...d\mu_n(x_k) \\ &\ge \frac{1}{k!}\int_{M^k} G_N(x_1, ..., x_k) d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_k),\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the lower semicontinuity of G_N and the fact that it is bounded from below. Finally, as G is bounded from below we can take N to infinity and use the monotone convergence theorem to get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \tilde{W}_n(\mu_n) \geq \frac{1}{k!}\int_{M^k} G(x_1,...,x_k)d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_k).$$

- **Upper limit assumption (H2).** Take $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ and notice that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n] = \frac{1}{n^k}\binom{n}{k}\int_{M^k} G(x_1,...,x_k)d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_k).$$

Then,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n] = \frac{1}{k!}\int_{M^k} G(x_1,...,x_k)d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_k).$$

□

Now we give a sufficient condition for a k-body interaction to satisfy the *confining assumption* (H4).

Lemma 2.3 (k-body interaction and confining assumption)**.** *Take $k > 0$ and a symmetric function bounded from below $G : M^k \to (-\infty, \infty]$. Define*

$$W_n : M^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$$

$$(x_1,...,x_n) \mapsto \frac{1}{n^k}\sum_{\substack{\{i_1,...,i_k\}\subset\{1,...,n\}\\ \#\{i_1,...,i_k\}=k}} G(x_{i_1},...,x_{i_k}).$$

Suppose $G(x_1,...,x_k)$ tends to infinity when $x_i \to \infty$ for all $i \in \{1,...,k\}$, i.e. suppose that for every $C \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a compact set K such that $G|_{K^c\times...\times K^c} \geq C$. Then the sequence $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4).

Proof. By Remark 1.8 we can suppose G positive. Remember the definition of $\tilde{W}_n$ in 1.4. All we need is the following result.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that G is positive. Take $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ that satisfies*

$$\tilde{W}_n(\mu) \leq A.$$

If K is a compact set such that $G|_{K^c\times...\times K^c} \geq C$ with $C > 0$, then

$$\mu(K^c) \leq \left(\frac{A}{C}\,k!\right)^{1/k} + \frac{k}{n}.$$

Proof. We first notice that $\mu = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$ for some $(x_1,...,x_n) \in M^n$. By the hypotheses we can see that

$$\frac{1}{n^k}[\text{number of } k\text{-combinations outside K}]\,C \leq \frac{1}{n^k}\sum_{\substack{\{i_1,...,i_k\}\subset\{1,...,n\}\\ \#\{i_1,...,i_k\}=k}} G(x_{i_1},...,x_{i_k}) \leq A. \tag{2.3}$$

where, more precisely, [number of k-combinations outside K] denotes the cardinal of the following set, $\{S \subset \{1, ..., n\} : \ \#S = k \text{ and } \forall i \in S,\, x_i \notin K\}$. But, if m denotes the number of points among $x_1, ..., x_n$ outside K and if $k \leq m$, we have

$$\frac{(m-k)^k}{k!} \leq \frac{m!}{(m-k)!\,k!} = [\text{number of } k\text{-combinations outside K}]$$

which, along with the inequality 2.3, implies

$$\frac{1}{n^k}\frac{(m-k)^k}{k!}C \leq A,$$

or, equivalently

$$\frac{m}{n} \leq \left(\frac{A}{C}\,k!\right)^{1/k} + \frac{k}{n}.$$

As $\mu = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{x_i}$ then

$$\mu(K^c) \leq \left(\frac{A}{C}\,k!\right)^{1/k} + \frac{k}{n}.$$

□

Take an increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a sequence of probability measures $\{\mu_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ on M. Suppose there exists a real constant A such that

$$\tilde{W}_{n_j}(\mu_j) \leq A$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We will prove that $\{\mu_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight and, by Prokhorov's theorem 7.3, relatively compact. Take $\epsilon > 0$. We are looking for a compact set K such that

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N},\ \mu_j(K^c) \leq \epsilon.$$

Choose $C > 0$ that satisfies

$$\left(\frac{A}{C}\,k!\right)^{1/k} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that satisfies

$$\frac{k}{N} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Take a compact set K_0 such that $G|_{K_0^c \times ... \times K_0^c} \geq C$. Then, if $j \geq N$ we have $n_j \geq N$ and by Lemma 2.4 we get

$$\forall j \geq N,\ \mu_j(K_0^c) \leq \epsilon.$$

As every probability measure is tight we can find a bigger compact set $K \supset K_0$ such that

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N},\ \mu_j(K^c) \leq \epsilon.$$

□

Finally we notice that in the *regularity assumption* (H3) we can replace finite entropy by absolute continuity with respect to π.

Lemma 2.5 (k-body interaction and regularity assumption)**.** *Take $k > 0$ and a measurable symmetric function bounded from below $G : M^k \to (-\infty, \infty]$. Define*

$$W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$$

$$\mu \mapsto \int_{M^k} G(x_1, ..., x_k)\, d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_k).$$

Let

$$\mathcal{N}_1 = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M) :\ D(\mu\|\pi) < \infty\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_2 = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M) :\ \mu \text{ is absolutely continuous with respect to } \pi\}.$$

Suppose that for every μ with $W(\mu) < \infty$, there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{N}_2$ such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$ then the same is true if we replace $\mathcal{N}_2$ by $\mathcal{N}_1$.

Proof. Notice that what we want to prove is equivalent to the following. If the closure of $\{(\mu, W(\mu)) : \mu \in \mathcal{N}_2\}$ contains $\{(\mu, W(\mu)) :\ W(\mu) < \infty\}$ then the closure of $\{(\mu, W(\mu)) :\ \mu \in \mathcal{N}_1\}$ contains $\{(\mu, W(\mu)) :\ W(\mu) < \infty\}$. So, it is enough to see that the closure of $\{(\mu, W(\mu)) :\ \mu \in \mathcal{N}_1\}$ contains $\{(\mu, W(\mu)) :\ \mu \in \mathcal{N}_2\}$, i.e. for every $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_2$ there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{N}_1$ such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$. Let ρ be the density of μ with respect to π, i.e. $d\mu = \rho\, d\pi$. For each $n > 0$ define $\mu_n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ by $d\mu_n = \frac{\rho \wedge n\, d\pi}{\int_M \rho \wedge n\, d\pi}$. Then, by the monotone convergence theorem we can see that $\mu_n \to \mu$. And, again, by the monotone convergence theorem, by supposing $G \geq 0$, we can see that $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$.

□

3 Proof of the theorems

This section is dedicated to the proof of the two main theorems, i.e. Theorem 1.1 and 1.3. We start giving a proof sketch along with some properties of the entropy that we will need.

3.1 Idea of the proofs

To prove both Laplace principles we shall use the following very known result that tells us the Legendre transform of $D(\cdot\|\mu)$, defined in 1.3. See [11, Proposition 4.5.1] or Appendix B for a proof.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (E, μ) be a Polish probability space and $g : E \to (-\infty, \infty]$ a measurable function bounded from below. Then*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[e^{-g}\right] = -\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(E)} \{\mathbb{E}_\tau [g] + D(\tau\|\mu)\}.$$

Remember the definition of γ_n in 1.1 and F in 1.2. With the help of Lemma 3.1 we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-n\beta_n f\circ i_n} d\gamma_n \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log\, \mathbb{E}_{\pi^{\otimes n}} \left[e^{-n\beta_n (f\circ\, i_n + W_n)}\right] \\
&\qquad = -\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)} [f] + \mathbb{E}_\tau [W_n] + \frac{1}{n\beta_n} D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, we need to prove that

$$\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}\left[f\right]+\mathbb{E}_{\tau}\left[W_n\right]+\frac{1}{n\beta_n}D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)}\{f\left(\mu\right)+F\left(\mu\right)\}. \tag{3.1}$$

To prove this we need the following properties of the entropy proven in Appendix D. The first one is analogous to the *lower limit assumption* (H1).

Lemma 3.2 (Lower limit property of the entropy)**.** *Let $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an increasing sequence in $\mathbb{N}$. For each $j\in\mathbb{N}$ take $\tau_j\in\mathcal{P}(M^{n_j})$. If $i_{n_j}(\tau_j)\to\zeta\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(M))$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta}\left[D\left(\cdot|\pi\right)\right]\leq\liminf_{j\to\infty}\frac{1}{n_j}D(\tau_j\|\pi^{\otimes_{n_j}}).$$

And the second one is analogous to the *confining assumption* (H4).

Lemma 3.3 (Confining property of the entropy)**.** *Let $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an increasing sequence in $\mathbb{N}$. For each $j\in\mathbb{N}$ take $\tau_j\in\mathcal{P}(M^{n_j})$. If there exists a real constant C such that*

$$\frac{1}{n_j}D(\tau_j\|\pi^{\otimes_{n_j}})\leq C$$

for every $j\in\mathbb{N}$, then the sequence $\{i_{n_j}(\tau_j)\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1: Case of finite β

In this subsection we shall prove the Laplace principle and the large deviation principle for the case of finite β, i.e. Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2.

By Remark 1.6, we can suppose $\beta_n=1$ for every n by redefinition of W_n and W. Then the *Gibbs measure* 1.1 and the *free energy* 1.2 are

$$d\gamma_n=e^{-nW_n}d\pi^{\otimes_n}\quad\text{and}\quad F=W+D(\cdot\|\pi).$$

As explained in subsection 3.1 we need to prove 3.1. We shall repeat the argument.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By definition of γ_n we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\int_{M^n}e^{-nf\circ i_n}d\gamma_n=\frac{1}{n}\log\,\mathbb{E}_{\pi^{\otimes_n}}\left[e^{-nf\circ i_n}e^{-nW_n}\right],$$

By Lemma 3.1, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}\log\,\mathbb{E}_{\pi^{\otimes_n}}\left[e^{-n(f\circ i_n+W_n)}\right]&=-\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{\tau}\left[f\circ i_n+W_n\right]+\frac{1}{n}D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}\\&=-\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}\left[f\right]+\mathbb{E}_{\tau}\left[W_n\right]+\frac{1}{n}D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

First, we will proof the **lower limit bound**

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n\to\infty}\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)}&\left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}\left[f\right]+\mathbb{E}_{\tau}\left[W_n\right]+\frac{1}{n}D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}\\&\geq\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)}\{f\left(\mu\right)+F\left(\mu\right)\}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

We shall proceed by contradiction. Suppose 3.2 is not true. Then,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}\left[f\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\tau}\left[W_n\right] + \frac{1}{n} D(\tau \| \pi^{\otimes n}) \right\}$$

$$< \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{ f\left(\mu\right) + F\left(\mu\right) \}.$$

So, there exists an increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^{n_j})} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{i_{n_j}(\tau)}\left[f\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\tau}\left[W_{n_j}\right] + \frac{1}{n_j} D(\tau \| \pi^{\otimes n_j}) \right\} < C < \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{ f\left(\mu\right) + F\left(\mu\right) \}$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find $\tau_j \in \mathcal{P}(M^{n_j})$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_{n_j}(\tau_j)}\left[f\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\tau_j}\left[W_{n_j}\right] + \frac{1}{n_j} D(\tau_j \| \pi^{\otimes n_j}) < C < \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{ f\left(\mu\right) + F\left(\mu\right) \}. \tag{3.3}$$

Using that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a *stable sequence*, i.e. it is uniformly bounded from below, we get that $\frac{1}{n_j} D(\tau_j \| \pi^{\otimes n_j})$ is uniformly bounded from above. By the *confining property of the entropy*, Lemma 3.3, we get that $i_{n_j}(\tau_j)$ is tight. By taking a subsequence using Prokhorov's theorem, we shall assume it converges to some $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(M))$. Then, by the *lower limit property of the entropy*, Lemma 3.2, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta}\left[D\left(\cdot|\pi\right)\right] \leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} \frac{1}{n_j} D(\tau_{n_j} \| \pi^{\otimes n_j}).$$

By Skorokhod's representation theorem we can realize the weak convergence $i_{n_j}(\tau_{n_j}) \to \zeta$ as an almost sure convergence $X_j \to X$ where $\{X_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of random variables taking values in $\mathcal{P}(M)$ such that for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the variable X_j has law $i_{n_j}(\tau_{n_j})$. Then, by the *lower limit assumption* (H1),

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \tilde{W}_{n_j}(X_j) \geq W(X).$$

We note that $\tilde{W}_n$ is measurable (see Appendix C) and that, by the *upper limit assumption* (H2) and the fact that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a *stable sequence*, W is bounded from below. So, as $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded from below, we can use Fatou's lemma to get

$$\mathbb{E}[W(X)] \leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_{n_j}(X_j)]$$

or, what is the same,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta}[W] \leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{n_j}}\left[W_{n_j}\right].$$

Then, by taking the lower limit when j tends to infinity in the inequality 3.3 we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta}\left[f + W + D(\cdot\|\pi)\right] \leq C < \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{ f\left(\mu\right) + F\left(\mu\right) \},$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta}\left[f + F\right] \leq C < \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{ f\left(\mu\right) + F\left(\mu\right) \},$$

which is impossible.

Now let us prove the **upper limit bound**

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}[f]+\mathbb{E}_{\tau}[W_n]+\frac{1}{n}D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}\\ \leq\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)}\{f(\mu)+F(\mu)\}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

We need to prove that for every probability measure $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)$

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}[f]+\mathbb{E}_{\tau}[W_n]+\frac{1}{n}D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}\\ \leq f(\mu)+F(\mu).\end{aligned}$$

It is enough to find a sequence $\tau_n\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau_n)}[f]+\mathbb{E}_{\tau_n}[W_n]+\frac{1}{n}D(\tau_n\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}\leq f(\mu)+F(\mu).$$

We shall choose $\tau_n=\mu^{\otimes_n}$. Then, we know that, by the law of large numbers and Proposition 7.1 in Appendix A, we have the weak convergence $i_n(\tau_n)\to\delta_\mu$, so

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau_n)}[f]=f(\mu).$$

By the *upper limit assumption* (H2), we get that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes_n}}[W_n]\leq W(\mu).$$

Finally, we use that

$$D(\tau_n\|\pi^{\otimes_n})=n\,D(\mu\|\pi)$$

to obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau_n)}\left[f+\tilde{W}_n\right]+\frac{1}{n}D(\tau_n\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\}=f(\mu)+W(\mu)+D(\mu\|\pi)$$

completing the proof.

□

Proof of Corollary 1.2. We know that the large deviation principle is equivalent to the Laplace principle for the sequence $i_n(\mathbb{P}_n)$ if the rate function has compact level sets (see [11, Theorem 1.2.1] and [11, Theorem 1.2.3]) This is the case because the entropy has compact level sets (see [11, Lemma 1.4.3 (c)]) and W is bounded from below, due to the *upper limit assumption* (H2) and the fact that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a *stable sequence*, and lower semicontinuous. Then we have to prove that, for every bounded continuous function $f:\mathcal{P}(M)\to\mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_n}\log\,\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\mathbb{P}_n)}\left[e^{-n\beta_n f}\right]\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}-\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)}\{f(\mu)+F(\mu)-\inf F\}$$

or, using the measures γ_n,

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_n}\log\int_{M^n}e^{-n\beta_n f\circ i_n}\frac{d\gamma_n}{Z_n}\xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{}-\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)}\{f(\mu)+F(\mu)-\inf F\}.$$

But, by Theorem 1.1 applied to the function $f = 0$ we get

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log\, Z_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} -\inf F$$

and combining it with

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-n\beta_n f\circ i_n} d\gamma_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} -\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + F(\mu)\}$$

we complete the proof.

□

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.3: Case of infinite β

In this subsection we provide a proof for Theorem 1.3 by modifying the proof of Theorem 1.1. Recall that from the definition of *Gibbs measure* 1.1 and *free energy* 1.2 now we have

$$d\gamma_n = e^{-n\beta_n W_n} d\pi^{\otimes n}, \quad \text{and} \quad F = W.$$

where $\beta_n \to \infty$.

We first notice that the *confining assumption* (H4) implies an a priori stronger property. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 7.4 in Appendix A.

Proposition 3.4. *Assume the sequence $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4) and take a sequence of probability measures $\{\chi_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ on $\mathcal{P}(M)$, i.e. $\chi_j \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(M))$. Suppose there exists an increasing sequence $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers and a constant $C < \infty$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\chi_j}\left[\tilde{W}_{n_j}\right] \le C$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\{\chi_j\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(M))$.*

Now we shall prove Theorem 1.3 .

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Take $f : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ bounded continuous. By Lemma 3.1 and following the argument in Subsection 3.1 about the idea of the proof we need to obtain 3.1, i.e.

$$\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}[f] + \mathbb{E}_\tau[W_n] + \frac{1}{n\beta_n} D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes n}) \right\} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + F(\mu)\}.$$

To prove the **lower limit bound**

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)} &\left\{ \mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}[f] + \mathbb{E}_\tau[W_n] + \frac{1}{n\beta_n} D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes n}) \right\} \\ &\ge \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + F(\mu)\} \end{aligned}$$

we proceed by contradiction as in Theorem 1.1 saying that if this were not the case there would exist an increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$, a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ and for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ a probability measure $\tau_j \in \mathcal{P}(M^{n_j})$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_{n_j}(\tau_j)}[f] + \mathbb{E}_{\tau_j}\left[W_{n_j}\right] + \frac{1}{n_j\beta_{n_j}} D(\tau_j\|\pi^{\otimes n_j}) < C < \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + F(\mu)\}.$$

Then, as the entropy is always positive we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{i_{n_j}(\tau_j)}[f] + \mathbb{E}_{\tau_j}\left[W_{n_j}\right] < C < \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + F(\mu)\}.$$

We see that $\mathbb{E}_{\tau_j}\left[W_{n_j}\right] = \mathbb{E}_{i_{n_j}(\tau_j)}\left[\tilde{W}_{n_j}\right]$ is a bounded sequence and, by the *confining assumption* (H4) and Proposition 3.4, we get that $i_{n_j}(\tau_j)$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(M))$. We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 where now W is bounded from below by the *regularity assumption* (H3) and because $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a *stable sequence*.
The proof of the **upper limit bound** follows the same reasoning as in Theorem 1.1. Take $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. To obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}[f] + \mathbb{E}_\tau[W_n] + \frac{1}{n\beta_n} D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\} \\ \leq f(\mu) + F(\mu),\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

we choose $\tau_n = \mu^{\otimes_n}$ and try to prove

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau_n)}[f] + \mathbb{E}_{\tau_n}[W_n] + \frac{1}{n\beta_n} D(\tau_n\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\} \leq f(\mu) + F(\mu).$$

By the law of large numbers, as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, this is true for μ in $\mathcal{N}$ defined in 1.5.

For general $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ take a sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{N}$ such that $\mu_k \to \mu$ and $\limsup_{k\to\infty} W(\mu_k) \leq W(\mu)$. This exists due to the *regularity assumption* (H3). Finally, take the upper limit when k goes to infinity in

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(M^n)} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\tau)}[f] + \mathbb{E}_\tau[W_n] + \frac{1}{n\beta_n} D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})\right\} \\ \leq f(\mu_k) + F(\mu_k),\end{aligned}$$

to obtain 3.5.

□

Proof of Corollary 1.4. It is the same proof as that of Corollary 1.2 with the additional assumption that we demand W to have compact level sets because F does not contain an entropy term. □

4 Applications

In this section we shall give the three main applications we are thinking of: Conditional Gibbs measure, Coulomb gas on a Riemannian manifold and the known results in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

4.1 Conditional Gibbs measure

In this subsection we shall treat the case of the Gibbs measure associated to a two-body interaction but with some of the points conditioned to be deterministic. We begin by a more general result. We shall suppose M compact.

Proposition 4.1 (Varying environment)**.** *Let $\{\nu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of probability measures on M such that $\nu_n \to \nu$. Suppose we have two lower semicontinuous functions $G^E, G^I : M\times M \to (-\infty,\infty]$ (and thus bounded from below) such that $x \mapsto \int_M G^E(x,y)d\nu(y)$ is continuous.*
Internal potential energy. *For each n we shall think of n particles interacting with the two particle potential G^I. This would give rise to an internal energy $W_n^I : M^n \to (-\infty,\infty]$*

$$W_n^I(x_1,...,x_n) = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}^{n} G^I(x_i,x_j)$$

and a macroscopic internal energy $W^I : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$

$$W^I(\mu) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{M \times M} G^I(x, y)\, d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

External potential energy. *The probability measure* ν_n *will interact with the* n *particles via the external potential* $V_n : M \to \mathbb{R}$ *defined by* $V_n(x) = \int_M G^E(x, y) d\nu_n(y)$. *This gives rise to the external energy* $W_n^E : M^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$

$$W_n^E(x_1, ..., x_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_n(x_i)$$

with a macroscopic external energy $W^E : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$

$$W^E(\mu) = \int_{M \times M} G^E(x, y)\, d\nu(x) d\mu(y).$$

Total potential energy. *For each* n *we define*

$$W_n = W_n^E + W_n^I \quad \text{and} \quad W = W^E + W^I.$$

Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}} = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(M) : \ D(\mu \| \pi) < \infty \text{ and } x \mapsto \int_M G^E(x, y) d\mu(y) \text{ is continuous} \right\}$$

and suppose that for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ *such that* $W^I(\mu) < \infty$ *there exists a sequence* $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ *of probability measures in* $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ *such that* $\mu_n \to \mu$ *and* $W^I(\mu_n) \to W^I(\mu)$.

Then, $\{W_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ *is a stable sequence,* W *is a lower semicontinuous function and* $(\{W_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, W)$ *satisfies the lower limit assumption (H1), and the regularity assumption (H3). In particular, if we choose* $\beta_n \to \infty$, *Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.4 may be applied for* $(\{W_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, W)$.

Proof. It is not hard to prove the stability and the lower semicontinuity. For instance, we can imitate the proof of Lemma 2.1. Let us prove the *lower limit assumption* (H1).

Lower limit assumption (H1). By Lemma 2.1, we already know that $(\{W_n^I\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, W^I)$ satisfies the *lower limit assumption* (H1). By Remark 1.7, we need to check this for $(\{W_n^E\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, W^E)$.

If $\mu_n = i_n(x_1, ..., x_n)$ then

$$\tilde{W}_n^E(\mu_n) = \int_M V_n d\mu_n = \int_{M \times M} G^E(x, y) d\mu_n(x) d\nu_n(y),$$

where $\tilde{W}_n^E$ is defined in 1.4. So, the *lower limit assumption* (H1) is a consequence of the lower semicontinuity of G^E.

Regularity assumption (H3). To prove the *regularity assumption* (H3) we take $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $W(\mu) < \infty$. Then $W^I(\mu) < \infty$. By hypothesis, we know that there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures in $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $W^I(\mu_n) \to W^I(\mu)$. As $x \mapsto \int_M G^E(x, y) d\nu(y)$ is continuous we also have that $W^E(\mu_n) \to W^E(\mu)$. So, $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$.

We have to prove that the sequence we chose is in the set $\mathcal{N}$ defined in 1.5 by

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(M) : \ D(\mu \| \pi) < \infty \text{ and } \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n] \leq W(\mu) \right\},$$

i.e. we need to see that $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \subset \mathcal{N}$.

Let $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n^E] &= \mathbb{E}_\mu[V_n] \\ &= \int_M \left(\int_M G^E(x,y) d\nu_n(y) \right) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_M \left(\int_M G^E(x,y) d\mu(x) \right) d\nu_n(y).\end{aligned}$$

So, as $y \mapsto \int_M G^E(x,y)d\mu(x)$ is continuous, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n^E] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \int_{M\times M} G^E(x,y)d\nu(y)d\mu(x) = W^E(\mu).$$

By Lemma 2.1 we already know that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n^I] = W^I(\mu)$ and then $\mu \in \mathcal{N}$.

□

Now, we take the particular case where ν_n is an empirical measure and interpret it as a conditioning.

Example 4.2 (Conditional Gibbs measure)**.** *Take a lower semicontinuous function $G : M \times M \to (-\infty, \infty]$. Define $G^I = G^E = G$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ choose $(y_1, ..., y_n) \in M^n$ and define $\nu_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{y_i}$. Suppose $\nu_n \to \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $x \mapsto \int_M G(x,y)d\nu(y)$ is continuous. With the notation of Proposition 4.1 we have that $W_n^E : M^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$ is given by $W_n^E(x_1, ..., x_n) = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i,j=1}^n G(x_i, y_j)$ and then that*

$$W_n(x_1, ..., x_n) = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}^n G(x_i, x_j) + \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i,j=1}^n G(x_i, y_j).$$

This suggests that we can think on the Gibbs probability measure (normalized Gibbs measure) associated to W_n and to some parameter β_n as the Gibbs probability measure associated to the energy

$$\mathcal{W}_n(x_1, ..., x_{2n}) = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i<j}^{2n} G(x_i, x_j).$$

conditioned to $(x_{n+1}, ..., x_{2n}) = (y_1, ..., y_n)$. Proposition 4.1 treats this case if $\beta_n \to \infty$ and if for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $\int_{M\times M} G(x,y)d\mu(x)d\mu(y) < \infty$ there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures on M such that $D(\mu_n\|\pi) < \infty$ and $x \mapsto \int_M G(x,y)d\mu_n(y)$ is continuous for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $\int_{M\times M} G(x,y)d\mu_n(x)d\mu_n(y) \to \int_{M\times M} G(x,y)d\mu(x)d\mu(y)$.

Proposition 4.3 (One particle conditional Gibbs measure)**.** *Take again a lower semicontinuous function $G : M \times M \to (-\infty, \infty]$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ choose $(y_1, ..., y_n) \in M^n$ and suppose that $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{y_i} \to \nu$ for some $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ and that $x \mapsto \int_M G(x,y)d\nu(y)$ is continuous. Define $V_n : M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ by $V_n(x) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n G(x, y_j)$. Take $\beta_n \to \infty$ and define the measures γ_n^c by*

$$d\gamma_n^c = e^{-\beta_n V_n} d\pi.$$

Then, we have the following Laplace principle.

For every (bounded) continuous function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$\frac{1}{\beta_n}\log \int_M e^{-\beta_n f} d\gamma_n^c \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} -\inf_{x\in M}\left\{ f(x) + \int_M G(x,y)d\nu(y) \right\}.$$

The normalization of γ_n^c can be thought of as the Gibbs probability measure associated to the energy $\mathcal{W}_n : M^{n+1} \to (-\infty, \infty]$

$$\mathcal{W}_n(x_1, ..., x_{n+1}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i<j}^{n+1} G(x_i, x_j)$$

conditioned to $(x_1, ..., x_n) = (y_1, ..., y_n)$.

Proof. To apply Proposition 4.1 define $G^I = 0$ and $G^E = G$.

With the notation of Proposition 4.1 we have that $V_n : M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ is given by $V_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n G(x, y_j)$ and $W_n^E : M^n \to (-\infty, \infty]$ is given by $W_n^E(x_1, ..., x_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_n(x_i)$. Then, $W_n = W_n^E$. As $G^I = 0$, there is no regularity assumption to prove.

From Proposition 4.1 we know that if $\beta_n \to \infty$ then for every (bounded) continuous function $\hat{f} : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-n\beta_n \hat{f} \circ i_n} d\gamma_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} - \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)} \{\hat{f}(\mu) + F(\mu)\}$$

where

$$d\gamma_n = e^{-n\beta_n W_n^E} d\pi^{\otimes_n}.$$

In particular, if $\hat{f}$ is given by integration against some (bounded) continuous function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$, i.e. $\hat{f}(\mu) = \int_M f d\mu$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-n\beta_n \hat{f} \circ i_n} d\gamma_n \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-\beta_n \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)} e^{-\beta_n \sum_{i=1}^n V_n(x_i)} d\pi(x_1) ... d\pi(x_n) \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{\beta_n} \log \int_M e^{-\beta_n f(x)} e^{-\beta_n V_n(x)} d\pi(x) \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{\beta_n} \log \int_M e^{-\beta_n f(x)} d\gamma_n^c(x)
\end{aligned}$$

converges to

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)} \{\hat{f}(\mu) + F(\mu)\} &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)} \left\{ \int_M f d\mu + \int_M \left(\int_M G(x, y) d\nu(y) \right) d\mu(x) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in M} \left\{ f(x) + \int_M G(x, y) d\nu(y) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.2 A Coulomb gas on a Riemannian manifold

Let (M, g) be a compact oriented n-dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary where g denotes the Riemannian metric. Denote by π the normalized volume form of (M, g). Notice that integrability with respect to π is equivalent to integrability with respect to any differentiable volume form and we may say that some function is integrable in this case without saying explicitly that it is with respect to π. A signed measure Λ will be called a differentiable signed measure if it is given by an n-form or equivalently if it has a differentiable density with respect to π. From now on we shall identify $\Omega^n(M)$ with the space of differentiable signed measures. Let $\Delta : C^\infty(M) \to \Omega^n(M)$ be the Laplacian operator, i.e. $\Delta = d * d$ where $*$ is the Hodge star operator or, equivalently, $\Delta f = \nabla^2 f \, d\pi$ where ∇^2 is the Laplace-Beltrami operator.

Proposition 4.4 (Green function)**.** *Take any differentiable signed measure Λ. Then, there exists a symmetric continuous function $G : M \times M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ such that for every $x \in M$ the function $G_x : M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ defined by $G_x(y) = G(x, y)$ is integrable and*

$$\Delta G_x = -\delta_x + \Lambda.$$

More explicitly, the previous equality can be written as follows. For every $f \in C^\infty(M)$ we have

$$\int_M G_x \, \Delta f = -f(x) + \int_M f d\Lambda.$$

Such a function will be called a Green function associated to Λ. Furthermore G is integrable with respect to $\pi \otimes \pi$. If μ is a differentiable signed measure then $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\psi(x) = \int_M G(x, y) d\mu(y)$ belongs to $C^\infty(M)$ and

$$\Delta \psi = -\mu + \mu(M)\Lambda.$$

In particular, we can get that G is bounded from below, $\int_M G_x d\Lambda$ does not depend on $x \in M$ and the Green function associated to Λ is unique up to an additive constant.

Proof. This result is well known if $\Lambda = \pi$. See for instance [19, Chapter 4]. Then we can take a symmetric continuous function $H : M \times M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ such that for every $x \in M$ the function $H_x : M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ defined by $H_x(y) = H(x, y)$ is integrable and

$$\Delta H_x = -\delta_x + \pi.$$

We also know that H is integrable with respect to $\pi \otimes \pi$.

For the case of general Λ choose $\phi \in C^\infty(M)$ such that

$$\Delta \phi = -\pi + \Lambda.$$

See [19, Theorem 4.7] for the existence of such ϕ. Define $G : M \times M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ by $G(x, y) = H(x, y) + \phi(x) + \phi(y)$. This is a symmetric continuous function such that for every $x \in M$ the function $G_x : M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ defined by $G_x(y) = G(x, y)$ is integrable and

$$\Delta G_x = \Delta H_x + \Delta \phi = -\delta_x + \pi + (-\pi + \Lambda) = -\delta_x + \Lambda.$$

The integrability of G with respect to $\pi \otimes \pi$ is a consequence of the integrability of H with respect to $\pi \otimes \pi$. We can see that G is bounded from below by the continuity of G so we shall suppose that G is positive for simplicity. Let μ be a differentiable signed measure and take $\rho \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $d\mu = \rho \, d\pi$. Then, $\int_{M \times M} G(x, y) d\pi(x) |\rho(y)| d\pi(y) < \infty$ and $\psi(x) = \int_{M \times M} G(x, y) \rho(y) d\pi(y)$ is defined for π - almost every $x \in M$, it is integrable with respect to π and, for every $f \in C^\infty(M)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_M \psi \, \Delta f &= \int_{M \times M} G(x, y) \Delta f(x) \rho(y) d\pi(y) \\
&= \int_M \left(\int_M G(x, y) \Delta f(x) \right) \rho(y) d\pi(y) \\
&= \int_M \left(-f(y) + \int_M f \, d\Lambda \right) \rho(y) d\pi(y) \\
&= -\int_M f \, d\mu + \mu(M) \int_M f \, d\Lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

This is precisely the relation

$$\Delta\psi = -\mu + \mu(M)\Lambda$$

in the sense of distributions. Then, by the ellipticity of Δ, we obtain that ψ is differentiable and

$$\Delta\psi = -\mu + \mu(M)\Lambda$$

in the usual pointwise sense. In particular, we get that if we define $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\psi(x) = \int_M G_x d\Lambda$ then $\Delta\psi = 0$ and so ψ is a constant.

To prove that G is unique up to an additive constant, take another Green function $\tilde{G}$ associated to Λ. Then, for every $x \in M$, $\Delta\tilde{G}_x = \Delta G_x$, i.e. $\int_M \tilde{G}_x \,\Delta f = \int_M G_x \,\Delta f$ for every $f \in C^\infty(M)$. This is equivalent to say that $\int_M \tilde{G}_x \, d\mu, = \int_M G_x \, d\mu$ for every differentiable signed measure μ such that $\mu(M) = 0$ because in this case $\mu = \Delta f$ for some $f \in C^\infty(M)$ by [19, Theorem 4.7]. Take any signed differentiable measure μ. Define the signed measure $\mu_0 = \mu - \mu(M)\Lambda$. Then, for every $x \in M$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_M \tilde{G}_x \, d\mu, &= \int_M \tilde{G}_x \, d\mu_0 + \mu(M) \int_M \tilde{G}_x \, d\Lambda, \\
&= \int_M G_x \, d\mu_0 + \mu(M) \left(\int_M \tilde{G}_x \, d\Lambda - \int_M G_x \, d\Lambda \right) + \mu(M) \int_M G_x \, d\Lambda \\
&= \int_M G_x \, d\mu + \mu(M) \left(\int_M \tilde{G}_x \, d\Lambda - \int_M G_x \, d\Lambda \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have already seen that $C = \int_M \tilde{G}_x \, d\Lambda - \int_M G_x \, d\Lambda$ does not depend on $x \in M$. Then, for every $x \in M$ we have the equality in distributions

$$\tilde{G}_x = G_x + C$$

that, by the continuity of $\tilde{G}_x$ and G_x, becomes a pointwise equality

$$\forall x, y \in M, \, \tilde{G}(x, y) = G(x, y) + C.$$

□

We fix a differentiable signed measure Λ. For simplicity we choose the Green function G associated to Λ that satisfies $\int_M G_x d\Lambda = 0$ for every $x \in M$. By Proposition 4.4 we know that G satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.1 about the two-body interaction. Define $W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$ by $W(\mu) = \int_{M\times M} G(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y)$. Then we can prove a strong form of the regularity assumption for W.

Proposition 4.5 (Regularity property of the Green energy)**.** *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. There exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of differentiable probability measures such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$.*

Proof. We can assume $W(\mu) < \infty$, otherwise any sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of differentiable probability measures such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ will satisfy $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$ due to the lower semicontinuity of W.

Using the proof of [2, Lemma 3.13] for the case of probability measures we know that the result is true for the Green function H associated to π. For general Λ, take $\phi \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $\Delta\phi = -\pi + \Lambda$ as in the proof of Proposition 4.4. Then $G : M \times M \to (-\infty, \infty]$ defined by $G(x, y) = H(x, y) + \phi(x) + \phi(y)$ is a Green function for Λ and for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ we have

$$\int_{M\times M} G(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) = \int_{M\times M} H(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) + 2 \int_M \phi \, d\mu.$$

From this relation and the result for H we get the result for G.

□

As a corollary we obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.6. *G satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.3 and Proposition 4.1 with $G^I = G$ and $G^E = G$.*

Remember the definitions of i_n, 1.6, and $\mathbb{P}_n$, 1.7. Let $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of random variables taking values in $\mathcal{P}(M)$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, X_n has law $i_n(\mathbb{P}_n)$. By studying the minimizers of the *free energy* F defined in 1.2 we can understand the possible limit points of $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. In particular, if F attains its minimum at a unique probability measure μ_{eq}, we get

$$X_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{a.s.} \mu_{eq}.$$

This is a consequence of Borel-Cantelli lemma and the large deviation principle in Corollary 1.2.

We shall now specialize to the case of dimension two and finite β because the minimizer of F has a nice geometric meaning in this case.

Proposition 4.7 (Convexity of W)**.** *W is convex.*

Proof. To prove the convexity it is enough to show that for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$

$$\frac{1}{2}W(\mu) + \frac{1}{2}W(\nu) \geq W\left(\frac{1}{2}\mu + \frac{1}{2}\nu\right).$$

due to the lower semicontinuity of W. Equivalently, we need to verify that, for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$,

$$\frac{1}{2}W(\mu) + \frac{1}{2}W(\nu) \geq \int_{M\times M} G(x,y)\, d\mu(x)\, d\nu(y). \tag{4.1}$$

If μ and ν are differentiable probability measures, i.e. differentiable signed measures that are probability measures, we can notice that the previous inequality 4.1 is equivalent to the inequality

$$\int_M \|\nabla(f-g)\|^2\, d\pi \geq 0.$$

where

$$f(x) = \int_M G(x,y)\, d\mu(y) \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) = \int_M G(x,y)\, d\nu(y).$$

This is due to the properties

$$\Delta f = -\mu + \Lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta g = -\nu + \Lambda$$

given in Proposition 4.4. In general, take μ, ν arbitrary. Choose two sequences $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\{\nu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of differentiable probability measures such that $\mu_n \to \mu$, $\nu_n \to \nu$ and $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$, $W(\nu_n) \to W(\nu)$, possible by Proposition 4.5. By the lower semicontinuity and lower boundedness of G we know that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{M\times M} G(x,y) d\mu_n(x) d\nu_n(y) \geq \int_{M\times M} G(x,y) d\mu(x) d\nu(x).$$

So, taking the lower limit when n tends to infinity in the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{2}W(\mu_n) + \frac{1}{2}W(\nu_n) \geq \int_{M\times M} G(x,y)\, d\mu_n(x)\, d\nu_n(y)$$

we get

$$\frac{1}{2}W(\mu) + \frac{1}{2}W(\nu) \geq \int_{M\times M} G(x,y)\, d\mu(x)\, d\nu(y).$$

□

As $D(\cdot\|\pi)$ is strictly convex (see [11, Lemma 1.4.3]) we know that the *free energy* F of parameter $\beta < \infty$ is strictly convex.

Let $\rho \in C^\infty(M)$ be a differentiable positive solution of the following equation (see [8])

$$\Delta \log \rho = \beta\, \mu_{eq} - \beta\Lambda.$$

where $d\mu_{eq} = \rho\, d\pi$. We shall prove that the functional F achieves its minimum at μ_{eq}. For this, we should calculate its derivative at μ_{eq}.

Lemma 4.8 (Derivative of W and of the entropy)**.** *Let μ be any probability measure different from μ_{eq} such that $F(\mu) < \infty$. Define*

$$\mu_t = t\mu + (1-t)\mu_{eq}, \quad t \in [0,1].$$

Then, $W(\mu_t)$ and $D(\mu_t\|\pi)$ are differentiable at $t = 0$, and

$$\frac{d}{dt}W(\mu_t)|_{t=0} = 2\int_{M\times M} G(x,y)\, d\mu_{eq}(x)\ (d\mu(y) - d\mu_{eq}(y))\ , \tag{4.2}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}D(\mu_t\|\pi)|_{t=0} = \int_M \log\rho(y)\,(d\mu(y) - d\mu_{eq}(y))\,. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. As $W(\mu)$ and $W(\mu_{eq})$ are finite and due to the convexity of W

$$\begin{aligned} W(\mu_t) &= t^2 \int_{M\times M} G(x,y) d\mu(x)\, d\mu(y) \\ + 2t(1-t)\int_{M\times M} G(x,y) d\mu_{eq}(x)\, d\mu(y) \quad &+ \quad (1-t)^2 \int_{M\times M} G(x,y) d\mu_{eq}(x)\, d\mu_{eq}(y) \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

is finite. The linear term (in the variable t) in 4.4 is

$$2\int_{M\times M} G(x,y)\, d\mu_{eq}(x)\ (d\mu(y) - d\mu_{eq}(y))\,,$$

and we have proven the first equality 4.2.

To prove the second equality 4.3 we write

$$D(\mu_t\|\pi) = \int_M \log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x) + (1-t)\rho(x)\right)\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x) + (1-t)\rho(x)\right)\, d\pi(x) \tag{4.5}$$

and due to the finiteness of $D(\mu_t\|\pi)$ we can notice that $\log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x) + (1-t)\rho(x)\right)$ is integrable with respect to μ and μ_{eq} for $0 < t < 1$. Developing the expression 4.5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mu_t\|\pi) = t\ &\int_M \log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x) + (1-t)\rho(x)\right)\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x) - \rho(x)\right)\, d\pi(x) \\ &+ \int_M \log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x) + (1-t)\rho(x)\right)\rho(x)\, d\pi(x) \end{aligned}$$

and we also have

$$D(\mu_0\|\pi) = \int_M \log(\rho(x))\,\rho(x)\, d\pi(x).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{t}\left(D(\mu_t\|\pi)-D(\mu_0\|\pi)\right)&\\ =\quad &\int_M \log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)+(1-t)\rho(x)\right)d\mu(x)\\ &-\int_M \log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)+(1-t)\rho(x)\right)d\mu_{eq}(x)\\ &+\int_M \frac{1}{t}\left[\log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)+(1-t)\rho(x)\right)-\log\rho(x)\right]\rho(x)\,d\pi(x).\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

For the first two terms on the right-hand side of 4.6 we notice that, when $t\searrow 0$,

$$\log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)+(1-t)\rho(x)\right)\to\log\rho(x).$$

Since each term is integrable with respect to μ and μ_{eq} for $0<t<1$ we can use the increasing monotone convergence theorem where $\rho(x)\geq\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)$ and the decreasing monotone convergence theorem where $\rho(x)<\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)$. We could have also said that $\left|\log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)+(1-t)\rho(x)\right)\right|$ is bounded by $\left|\log\left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)+\frac{1}{2}\rho(x)\right)\right|+|\log(\rho(x))|$ for $0<t\leq\frac{1}{2}$ and use the dominated convergence theorem. For the last term in 4.6 we see that

$$\frac{1}{t}\left[\log\left(t\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)+(1-t)\rho(x)\right)-\log\rho(x)\right]\rho(x)\nearrow\left[\frac{d\mu}{d\pi}(x)-\rho(x)\right].$$

as $t\searrow 0$ and since each term is integrable with respect to π we can use the monotone convergence theorem again to get a zero limit.

□

Theorem 4.9 (Minimizer of F)**.** *Let ρ be a positive differentiable solution to*

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\log\rho&=\beta\,\mu_{eq}-\beta\Lambda\\ d\mu_{eq}&=\rho\,d\pi.\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Then $F(\mu_{eq})<F(\mu)$ for every $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)$ different from μ_{eq}. In particular, the solution to 4.7 is unique.

Proof. As in Lemma 4.8 let μ be any probability measure different from μ_{eq} such that $F(\mu)<\infty$. Define

$$\mu_t=t\mu+(1-t)\mu_{eq},\quad t\in[0,1].$$

Take the equality

$$\Delta\log\rho=\beta\,\mu_{eq}-\beta\Lambda,$$

multiply it by $G(x,y)$ and integrate in one variable to get

$$-\log\rho(y)+\int_M\log\rho(x)\,d\Lambda(x)=\beta\int_M G(x,y)\rho(x)\,d\pi(x).$$

Then, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}F(\mu_t)|_{t=0} \\
&\quad= \int_{M\times M} G(x,y)d\mu_{eq}(x)\ (d\mu(y)-d\mu_{eq}(y)) + \frac{1}{\beta}\int_{M\times M}\log\rho(y)\,(d\mu(y)-d\mu_{eq}(y)) \\
&\quad= \int_M \left(\int_M G(x,y)\rho(x)\,d\pi(x) + \frac{1}{\beta}\log\rho(y)\right)(d\mu(y)-d\mu_{eq}(y)) \\
&\quad= \frac{1}{\beta}\int_M \left(\int_M \log\rho(x)\,d\Lambda(x)\right)(d\mu(y)-d\mu_{eq}(y)) \\
&\quad= \frac{1}{\beta}\left(\int_M \log\rho(x)\,d\Lambda(x)\right)\left(\int_M (d\mu(y)-d\mu_{eq}(y))\right) = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies, due to the strict convexity of $F(\mu_t)$ in t, that

$$F(\mu_{eq}) < F(\mu).$$

□

Remark 4.10 (Scalar curvature relation)**.** *We shall suppose that $\chi(M)$, the Euler characteristic of M, is different from zero. If $\bar{g}$ is any metric, we denote by $R_{\bar{g}}$ the scalar curvature of $\bar{g}$. Choose*

$$d\Lambda = \frac{R_g\,d\pi}{4\pi\chi(M)}.$$

It can be seen that if $\bar{g}=\rho g$, where $\int_M \rho\,d\pi = 1$, then

$$\Delta\log\rho = R_g d\pi - R_{\bar{g}}\rho\,d\pi.$$

With this identity we can prove that ρ is a solution to

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{\bar{g}} &= (4\pi\chi(M)+\beta)\,R_g\rho^{-1} - \beta \\
\bar{g} &= \rho\,g
\end{aligned}
$$

if and only if ρ is a solution to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta\log\rho &= \beta\,\mu_{eq} - \beta\Lambda \\
d\mu_{eq} &= \rho\,d\pi.
\end{aligned}
$$

In particular, if $\chi(M)<0$ and $\beta = -4\pi\chi(M)$ then $\bar{g}$ satisfies

$$R_{\bar{g}} = 4\pi\chi(M),$$

i.e. $\bar{g}$ is a metric with constant curvature.

4.3 Relation to other articles

Suppose that l is a not necessarily finite measure on the Polish space M. Let $V: M\to(-\infty,\infty]$ and $G: M\times M\to(-\infty,\infty]$ be lower semicontinuous functions with G symmetric and such that $(x,y)\mapsto G(x,y)+V(x)+V(y)$ is bounded from below. Define $H_n: M^n\to(-\infty,\infty]$ by

$$H_n(x_1,...,x_n) = \sum_{i<j}^{n} G(x_i,x_j) + n\sum_{i=1}^{n} V(x_i)$$

and $W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$ by

$$W(\mu) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{M \times M} (G(x,y) + V(x) + V(y))\, d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

Take a sequence $\{\beta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\beta_n \to \infty$ and let γ_n be the Gibbs measure defined by

$$d\gamma_n = e^{-\frac{\beta_n}{n} H_n} dl^{\otimes_n}.$$

We shall give some hypothesis that imply that γ_n satisfies a Laplace principle.

The first example is the most straightforward.

Proposition 4.11 (Weakly confining case)**.** *Take $\beta_n = n$. Suppose that*

- $\int_M e^{-V} dl < \infty$,
- *the function $(x,y) \mapsto G(x,y) + V(x) + V(y)$ is bounded from below,*
- $G(x,y) + V(x) + V(y) \to \infty$ *when $x, y \to \infty$ at the same time, and*
- *for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $W(\mu) < \infty$, there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures absolutely continuous with respect to l such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$.*

Then, for every bounded continuous function $f : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-n^2 f \circ i_n} d\gamma_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} - \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + W(\mu)\}.$$

Proof. Assume $\int_M e^{-V} dl = 1$ for simplicity. We notice that

$$d\gamma_n = e^{-\left(\sum_{i<j}^n G(x_i,x_j) + (n-1)\sum_{i=1}^n V(x_i)\right)} d(e^{-V} l)^{\otimes_n}.$$

If we define

$$\tilde{G}(x,y) = G(x,y) + V(x) + V(y)$$

and

$$W_n(x_1, ..., x_n) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i<j}^n \tilde{G}(x_i, x_j)$$

we have

$$d\gamma_n = e^{-n^2 W_n} d(e^{-V} l)^{\otimes_n}.$$

We now prove that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the conditions necessary to apply Theorem 1.3.

Lower and upper limit assumption, (H1) and (H2). By hypotheses, $\tilde{G}$ is lower semicontinuous and bounded from below. We can apply Lemma 2.1 to get that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a *stable sequence* and that $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the *lower limit assumption* (H1) and the *upper limit assumption* (H2).

Regularity assumption (H3). Take $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $W(\mu) < \infty$. Then, by hypothesis, there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures absolutely continuous with respect to l such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$. As $W(\mu) < \infty$ we can assume $W(\mu_n) < \infty$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We want to prove that μ_n is absolutely continuous with respect to the measure defined by $e^{-V} dl$. For this it is enough to notice that $\mu_n(\{x \in M : V(x) = \infty\}) = 0$. We can see that the set $\{(x,y) \in M \times M : V(x) = \infty \text{ and } V(y) = \infty\}$ is included in the set $\{(x,y) \in M \times M : G(x,y) + V(x) + V(y) = \infty\}$. The latter has zero measure because $W(\mu) < \infty$ and we conclude by definition of product measure.

Confining assumption (H4). Using that $\tilde{G}(x,y) \to \infty$ when $x, y \to \infty$ at the same time and Lemma 2.3 we get that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the *confining assumption* (H4).

We can finally apply Theorem 1.3. ∎

The second example is related to the article this work is inspired on, i.e. [12].

Proposition 4.12 (Strongly confining case)**.**
Suppose that

- *There exists $\xi > 0$ such that $\int_M e^{-\xi V} dl < \infty$,*
- *V is bounded from below,*
- *there exists $\epsilon \in [0,1)$ such that $(x,y) \mapsto G(x,y) + \epsilon V(x) + \epsilon V(y)$ is bounded from below,*
- *the function $G(x,y) + V(x) + V(y)$ tends to infinity when $x, y \to \infty$ at the same time, and*
- *for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $W(\mu) < \infty$, there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures absolutely continuous with respect to l such that $\mu_n \to \mu$ and $W(\mu_n) \to W(\mu)$.*

Then, for every bounded continuous function $f : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_n} \log \int_{M^n} e^{-n\beta_n f \circ i_n} d\gamma_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} - \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + W(\mu)\}.$$

Proof. We can assume $\int_M e^{-\xi V} dl = 1$ for simplicity. Then we can write

$$d\gamma_n = e^{-\frac{\beta_n}{n}\left(\sum_{i<j}^n G(x_i,x_j) + \left(n - \frac{n}{\beta_n}\xi\right)\sum_{i=1}^n V(x_i)\right)} d(e^{-\xi V} l)^{\otimes_n}.$$

which may only make sense for n large enough due to some positive and negative infinities. If we define

$$G^n(x,y) = G(x,y) + \frac{1}{n-1}\left(n - \frac{n}{\beta_n}\xi\right) V(x) + \frac{1}{n-1}\left(n - \frac{n}{\beta_n}\xi\right) V(y)$$

and

$$W_n(x_1, ..., x_n) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i<j}^n G^n(x_i, x_j)$$

we have

$$d\gamma_n = e^{-n\beta_n W_n} d(e^{-\xi V} l)^{\otimes_n}.$$

Now we can try to apply Theorem 1.3 to get the Laplace principle. Define

$$G_1(x,y) = G(x,y) + \epsilon V(x) + \epsilon V(y), \quad W_n^1(x_1, ..., x_n) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i<j}^n G_1(x_i, x_j),$$

$$G_2(x,y) = (1-\epsilon) V(x) + (1-\epsilon) V(y), \quad W_n^2(x_1, ..., x_n) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i<j}^n G_2(x_i, x_j)$$

and

$$a_n = \frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\left(n - \frac{n}{\beta_n}\xi\right) - \epsilon\right) \to 1.$$

This definitions allow us to write

$$W_n = W_n^1 + a_n W_n^2.$$

We start by proving the *lower limit assumption* (H1) and the *upper limit assumption* (H2).

Lower and upper limit assumption, (H1) and (H2). By the hypotheses, we can see that G_1 and G_2 are lower semicontinuous functions bounded from below. Then, we can apply Lemma 2.1 about the two-body interaction to get that $\{W_n^1\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{W_n^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are stable sequences and if we define the lower semicontinuous functions $W^1(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G_1(x,y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y)$ and

$W^2(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} G_2(x,y)d\mu(x)d\mu(y)$, then $(\{W_n^1\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W^1)$ and $(\{W_n^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W^2)$ satisfy the *lower limit assumption* (H1) and the *upper limit assumption* (H2).

Then, as $a_n > 0$ for n large enough, we get that $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a stable sequence for n large enough. Noticing that

$$W^1(\mu) + W^2(\mu) = W(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{M\times M} (G(x,y) + V(x) + V(y))\, d\mu(x)d\mu(y).$$

we obtain, by Remark 1.6 and 1.7 about the linear combination of stable sequences, that $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the *lower limit assumption* (H1) and the *upper limit assumption* (H2).

Confining assumption (H4). By Lemma 2.3 about the confining assumption in the k-body interaction and by the fact that $G(x,y)+V(x)+V(y) \to \infty$ when $x, y \to \infty$ at the same time, we get that $\{W_n^1 + W_n^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the *confining assumption* (H4), and by Remark 1.9, $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the *confining assumption* (H4).

Regularity assumption (H3). By an argument similar to the one given in the proof of Proposition 4.11 we can prove the *regularity assumption* (H3) for W.

We have proven the conditions to apply Theorem 1.3.

□

5 About Fekete points: case of infinite β_n

Instead of defining the sequence of probability measures

$$d\mathbb{P}_n = \frac{1}{Z_n} e^{-n\beta_n W_n} d\pi^{\otimes_n},$$

we will take $\beta_n = \infty$. Intuitively the important points in this case will be the points that minimize W_n. The empirical measures associated to those points should converge to the minimizer of W. More precisely, we have the following result.

Theorem 5.1 (Almost minimizers converge to minimizers)**.** *Let $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a stable sequence and let $W : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ be some function such that $(\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, W)$ satisfies the lower and upper limit assumptions (H1) and (H2). For each n take $x^n \in M^n$ such that*

$$\epsilon_n := |W_n(x^n) - \inf(W_n)| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0.$$

Then, if $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ is a limit point of $\{i_n(x^n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, i.e. if there exists an increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{n_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $i_{n_j}(x^{n_j}) \to \mu$, we get

$$W(\mu) = \inf(W) \quad \text{and} \quad W_{n_j}(x^{n_j}) \xrightarrow[j\to\infty]{} W(\mu).$$

In particular, if $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the confining assumption (H4) we get that

$$\inf(W_n) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \inf(W)$$

and if additionally W has a unique minimizer μ we get

$$i_n(x^n) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \mu.$$

Proof. By the *upper limit assumption* (H2) we have that, for every probability measure α on M,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\alpha^{\otimes n}}[W_n] \leq W(\alpha).$$

Then, as $\inf(W_n) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\alpha^{\otimes n}}[W_n]$, we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \{\inf(W_n)\} \leq W(\alpha)$$

for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. This implies that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \{\inf(W_n)\} \leq \inf(W).$$

But,

$$W_n(x^n) = \inf(W_n) + \epsilon_n,$$

so we also have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} W_n(x^n) \leq \inf(W).$$

Now, let $\{x^{n_j}\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the subsequence such that

$$i_{n_j}(x^{n_j}) \xrightarrow[j\to\infty]{} \mu.$$

By the *lower limit assumption* (H1) and Remark 1.5 we know that

$$W(\mu) \leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} W_{n_j}(x^{n_j}),$$

and we get

$$W(\mu) \leq \liminf_{j\to\infty} W_{n_j}(x^{n_j}) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} W_n(x^n) \leq \inf(W).$$

□

Notice that we have proved that even if W were not measurable and $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the *confining assumption* (H4) then W attains its infimum.

6 Final comments: About Laplace-Varadhan lemma

As mentioned in the introduction, Theorem 1.1 has a nice corollary as some kind of Laplace-Varadhan lemma for Sanov's theorem.

Corollary 6.1 (Generalized Laplace-Varadhan lemma for Sanov's theorem)**.** *Define $\mathbb{P}_n = i_n(\pi^{\otimes n})$ and denote by $\mathbb{E}_n$ the expected value with respect to $\mathbb{P}_n$. Let $\{f_n : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of measurable functions uniformly bounded from below and suppose we have a measurable function $f : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$ such that*

- *for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{i_n(\mu^{\otimes n})}[f_n] \leq f(\mu)$, and*
- *for every sequence of probability measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that converges to some $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$,*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} f_n(\mu_n) \geq f(\mu).$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{n}\log \mathbb{E}_n[e^{-nf_n}] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} -\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M)} \{f(\mu) + D(\mu\|\pi)\}$$

Proof. To see it as a corollary of Theorem 1.1 we define $W_n = f_n \circ i_n$ and $W = f$. We need to prove the *lower limit assumption* (H1) and the *upper limit assumption* (H2).
Lower limit assumption (H1). Notice that $\tilde{W}_n \geq f_n$, where $\tilde{W}_n$ is defined as in 1.4. Take a sequence of probability measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that converges to some $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. We get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \tilde{W}_n(\mu_n) \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} f_n(\mu_n) \geq f(\mu)$$

and this proves the *lower limit assumption* (H1).
Upper limit assumption (H2). Take $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. Then, $\mathbb{E}_{i_n(\mu^{\otimes n})}[f_n] = \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[f_n \circ i_n] = \mathbb{E}_{\mu^{\otimes n}}[W_n]$ and the hypothesis $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{i_n(\mu^{\otimes n})}[f_n] \leq f(\mu)$ implies the *upper limit assumption* (H2).

□

In fact, it is interesting to notice that we could have proven this corollary first and use it to prove Theorem 1.1 by making $f_n = \tilde{W}_n$ and $f = W$.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Raphaël Butez, Djalil Chafaï and Adrien Hardy for their useful remarks.

7 Appendices

A Convergence of probability measures

Let M be a Polish space, i.e. a separable topological space metrizable by a complete metric. Endow it with the Borel σ-algebra associated to this topology, i.e. the σ-algebra generated by the topology. We will endow $\mathcal{P}(M)$, the space of probability measures on M, with a topology such that a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{P}(M)$ converge to $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ if and only if $\int_M f d\mu_n \to \int_M f d\mu$ for every bounded continuous function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$.

To define this topology, for any bounded measurable function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ we define the function

$$\hat{f} : \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \mu \mapsto \int_M f d\mu. \tag{7.1}$$

The topology on $\mathcal{P}(M)$ we will consider is the smallest such that $\hat{f}$ is continuous for every bounded continuous function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$. With this topology, $\mathcal{P}(M)$ is also a Polish space (see [16, Section 1.4] and [16, Section 1.6] for a proof). This is called weak or vague topology. We need the following characterization of the convergence.

Proposition 7.1 (Convergence in $\mathcal{P}(M)$)**.** *There exists a countable family of bounded continuous functions $\{f_i : M \to \mathbb{R}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that given any sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures on M and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ we have that*

$$\mu_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \mu \quad \textit{if and only if} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \int_M f_i d\mu_n \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \int_M f_i d\mu.$$

Proof. As M is a separable metrizable topological space, there exists a metric d that induces its topology and such that the space of bounded uniformly continuous functions is separable with respect to the topology of uniform convergence associated with d. See [18, Lemma 9.1.4.] or [16, Lemme 1.2 and 1.3] for a proof. Then we take $\{f_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ as a dense sequence of bounded uniformly continuous functions to finish the proof using Portmanteau theorem.

□

Corollary 7.2 (Equality of probability measures)**.** *There exists a countable family of bounded continuous functions $\{f_i : M \to \mathbb{R}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ that determines probability measures, i.e. such that given μ and ν any two probability measures on M*

$$\mu = \nu \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \int_M f_i d\mu = \int_M f_i d\nu.$$

A very important concept in analysis is the one of relatively compact. A subset A of a topological space X is said to be relatively compact (in X) if its closure is compact. If X is metrizable this is equivalent to say that every sequence in A has a subsequence that converges (to some point in X). If $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in X then the set $A = \{x_n : \ n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is relatively compact if and only if for every subsequence of $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ there exists a further subsubsequence that converges (to some point in X).

This tells us that if we can characterize the relatively compact sets then we are able to know when we can extract subsequences.

Theorem 7.3 (Prokhorov's theorem)**.** *Let M be a Polish space. A subset $A \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$ is relatively compact if and only if it is tight, i.e. for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $K \subset M$ such that*

$$\forall \mu \in A, \ \mu(K) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Proof. See [7, Section 5] or [16, Theorem 1.7]. □

The following two propositions are related to the notion of tightness and are important for taking subsequences on the proofs of the Laplace principles.

Proposition 7.4 (Tightness and the confining assumption)**.** *Let M be a Polish space and $\{f_n : M \to (-\infty, \infty]\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of measurable functions uniformly bounded from below such that, for all $C \in \mathbb{R}$, every sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of points in M with $f_n(x_n) \leq C$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is relatively compact. Then, for all $C \in \mathbb{R}$, every sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures on M such that $\int_M f_n d\mu_n \leq C$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is tight.*

Proof. By adding a constant we can suppose that f_n is positive for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Take $C > 0$ and a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures on M such that $\int_M f_n d\mu_n \leq C$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. We look for a compact set $K \subset M$ such that

$$\mu_n(K) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for a moment. Take $A_n = \{x \in M : \ f_n(x) \leq \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\}$. Then, by the positivity of f_n we have

$$\frac{2C}{\epsilon}\mu_n(A_n^c) \leq \int_{A_n^c} f_n d\mu_n \leq C.$$

So,

$$\mu_n(A_n) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Take a compact set K_n such that

$$\mu_n(K_n) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Then, consider the set

$$A = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (K_n \cap A_n).$$

We affirm that A is relatively compact. For this, take a sequence $\{x_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ in A. We want to prove that it has a convergent subsequence.

If there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_k \in \bigcup_{n=0}^{N} (K_n \cap A_n)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then there exists $P \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_k \in K_P \cap A_P$ for an infinite number of k. As K_P is compact we can find a convergent subsequence.

If there does not exists such $N \in \mathbb{N}$ then we can find a subsequence $\{x_{k_i}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that there exists an increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{n_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $x_{k_i} \in A_{n_i}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We can think of the subsequence $\{x_{k_i}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ as a subsequence of some other sequence $\{y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that satisfies $y_{n_i} = x_{k_i}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_n(y_n) \leq C$ for the rest of n. So, as $f_n(y_n) \leq 2C/\epsilon$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we know by hypothesis that $\{y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact and then that $\{x_{k_i}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact and we can find a convergent subsequence.

We take $K = \bar{A}$ the closure of A and notice that

$$\mu_n(K) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Let $\chi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(M))$. We shall say that $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ is the expected value of χ if one of the following equivalent conditions is satisfied.

- For every measurable set $A \subset M$, $\mathbb{E}_\chi\left[\hat{1}_A\right] = \mu(A)$.
- For every bounded continuous function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}_\chi\left[\hat{f}\right] = \int_M f d\mu$.

We are using the notation introduced in 7.1.

Proposition 7.5 (Tightness criterion using expected values)**.** *Let $\{\chi_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a family of probability measures on the space of probability measures, i.e. $\chi_\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(M))$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and let $\{\mu_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be the family of expected values.*

Then, $\{\chi_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is tight if and only if $\{\mu_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is tight.

Proof. **Suppose $\{\chi_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is tight**. That means that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $B \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $\chi_\lambda(B) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then, as B is compact, it is tight. There exists a compact set $K \subset M$ such that $\mu(K) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for every $\mu \in B$. We are going to prove that $\mu_\lambda(K) \geq 1 - \epsilon$. for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$. In the following we will write explicitly the variable μ in the functions we will take expected value. Take $\lambda \in \Lambda$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\chi_\lambda}\left[1_{B^c}(\mu)\,\mu(K^c)\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\chi_\lambda}\left[1_B(\mu)\,\mu(K^c)\right] = \mu_\lambda(K^c).$$

But

$$\mathbb{E}_{\chi_\lambda}\left[1_{B^c}(\mu)\,\mu(K^c)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\chi_\lambda}\left[1_{B^c}(\mu)\right] \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\chi_\lambda}\left[1_B(\mu)\,\mu(K^c)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\chi_\lambda}\left[1_B(\mu)\,\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right] \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

So,

$$\mu_\lambda(K^c) \leq \epsilon.$$

Now **suppose $\{\mu_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is tight** and take $\epsilon > 0$. Take a sequence of positive numbers $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \epsilon_n = \epsilon$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ take $K_n \subset M$ compact such that $\mu_\lambda(K_n) \geq 1 - \epsilon_n^2$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\chi_\lambda\left(\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M) :\ \mu(K_n^c) \geq \epsilon_n\}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon_n}\mathbb{E}_{\chi_\lambda}[\mu(K_n^c)] = \frac{1}{\epsilon_n}\mu_\lambda(K_n^c) \leq \epsilon_n.$$

So,

$$\chi_\lambda\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M):\ \mu(K_n^c)\geq\epsilon_n\}\right)\leq\epsilon.$$

Then

$$B=\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(M):\ \mu(K_n)>1-\epsilon_n\}$$

satisfies

$$\chi_\lambda(B)\geq 1-\epsilon$$

for every $\lambda\in\Lambda$. By definition B is tight and, by Prokhorov's theorem 7.3, it is relatively compact. Then its closure $\bar{B}$ is a compact subset of $\mathcal{P}(M)$ that satisfies

$$\chi_\lambda(\bar{B})\geq 1-\epsilon$$

for every $\lambda\in\Lambda$.

□

B Variational representation

We shall prove Lemma 3.1. Let (E,μ) be a Polish probability space and $g:E\to(-\infty,\infty]$ a measurable function bounded from below. We want to prove that

$$\log\mathbb{E}_\mu\left[e^{-g}\right]=-\inf_{\tau\in\mathcal{P}(E)}\left\{\mathbb{E}_\tau[g]+D(\tau\|\mu)\right\}. \tag{7.2}$$

The easiest case is when g is infinite μ - almost surely or, equivalently, $E_\mu[e^{-g}]=0$. In particular, if $\tau\in\mathcal{P}(E)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ then $\mathbb{E}_\tau[g]$ is infinite. So, $\mathbb{E}_\tau[g]+D(\tau\|\mu)$ is infinite for every $\tau\in\mathcal{P}(E)$ and, as $\log\mathbb{E}_\mu[e^{-g}]$ is minus infinity, we have proven 7.2. Now suppose $\mathbb{E}_\mu[e^{-g}]>0$. First, let us prove that, for every $\tau\in\mathcal{P}(E)$,

$$-\log\mathbb{E}_\mu\left[e^{-g}\right]\leq\mathbb{E}_\tau[g]+D(\tau\|\mu). \tag{7.3}$$

If $D(\tau\|\mu)=\infty$ or $\mathbb{E}_\tau[g]=\infty$, the inequality is clearly true. Suppose $D(\tau\|\mu)<\infty$ and $\mathbb{E}_\tau[g]<\infty$. Then $d\tau=\rho\,d\mu$ for some measurable function $\rho:E\to[0,\infty)$ and g is finite τ - almost surely. As the support of τ is contained in the support of μ we have

$$-\log\mathbb{E}_\mu\left[e^{-g}\right]\leq-\log\mathbb{E}_\tau\left[e^{-g}e^{-\log\rho}\right]$$

where $\log\rho$ is defined as 0 if $\rho=0$ for simplicity. By Jensen's inequality,

$$-\log\mathbb{E}_\tau\left[e^{-g}e^{-\log\rho}\right]\leq\mathbb{E}_\tau[g+\log\rho]=\mathbb{E}_\tau[g]+D(\tau\|\mu),$$

and we get 7.3. Now, as $\mathbb{E}_\mu[e^{-g}]>0$ we can define $\tau\in\mathcal{P}(E)$ by $d\tau=\frac{e^{-g}}{\mathbb{E}_\mu[e^{-g}]}\,d\mu$ and see that

$$-\log\mathbb{E}_\mu\left[e^{-g}\right]=\mathbb{E}_\tau[g]+D(\tau\|\mu)$$

which proves that the infimum in 7.2 is attained.

C Measurability of $\tilde{W}_n$

We will prove that the applications $\tilde{W}_n$ defined in 1.4 are measurable.

Proposition 7.6 (Measurability of $\tilde{W}_n$)**.** *Take a symmetric measurable function*

$$W_n : M^n \to \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $\tilde{W}_n$ defined by

$$\tilde{W}_n : \mathcal{P}(M) \to (-\infty, \infty]$$
$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{x_i} \to W_n(x_1, ..., x_n)$$

and ∞ otherwise, is measurable.

Proof. The application

$$i_n : M^n \to \mathcal{P}(M)$$
$$(x_1, ..., x_n) \mapsto \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{x_i}$$

is continuous and closed. To see why it is closed take a closed subset $F \subset M^n$ and a sequence $\{z_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ in F such that $i_n(z_i)$ converge to some $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ as $i \to \infty$. We have to prove that $\mu \in i_n(F)$. As the sequence is tight we can get a compact subset $K \subset M$ such that $i_n(z_i)(K) > 1 - \frac{1}{n}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies, by the nature of $i_n(z_i)$, that $i_n(z_i)(K) = 1$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ or, what is the same, $z_i \in K^n$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. So, $\{z_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence that converge to some $z \in F$ and, by continuity, $i_n(z) = \mu$. In particular, $\mu \in i_n(F)$.

Take $S(M^n) = M^n/S_n$ where S_n is the symmetric group of n symbols that acts continuously on M^n. Let $p : M^n \to S(M^n)$ be the canonical projection map. We can see that the unique application

$$\tilde{i}_n : S(M^n) \to \mathcal{P}(M),$$

such that $\tilde{i}_n \circ p = i_n$, is continuous. In fact, it is an homeomorphism onto its image by the continuity and the closedness of i_n, and its image $\tilde{i}_n(S(M^n)) = i_n(M^n)$ is closed. So, what we need to prove is that the unique function

$$w_n : S(M^n) \to \mathbb{R},$$

such that $w_n \circ p = W_n$, is measurable (with respect to the Borel σ-algebra on $S(M^n)$).

For this we shall use the following result.

Lemma 7.7 (Invariant open sets generate invariant measurable sets)**.** *Let (X, τ) be a metrizable topological space and G a finite group that acts continuously on X. Let $\mathcal{B} = \sigma(\tau)$ (the σ-algebra generated by τ).*
Take

$$S_\tau = \{A \in \tau : \ \forall g \in G, \ g(A) = A\}$$

and

$$S_{\mathcal{B}} = \{A \in \mathcal{B} : \ \forall g \in G, \ g(A) = A\}.$$

Then

$$\sigma(S_\tau) = S_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Proof of the lemma. As $S_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a σ-algebra and $S_\tau \subset S_{\mathcal{B}}$, it is clear that $\sigma(S_\tau) \subset S_{\mathcal{B}}$. We want to prove that $S_{\mathcal{B}} \subset \sigma(S_\tau)$. Define

$$F = \left\{ A \subset X : \bigcup_{g \in G} g(A) \in \sigma(S_\tau) \right\}.$$

To get $S_{\mathcal{B}} \subset \sigma(S_\tau)$ it is enough to prove that $\mathcal{B} \subset F$. Then we can complete the proof by saying that if $A \in S_{\mathcal{B}}$ then $A \in F$ (because $\mathcal{B} \subset F$) and $A = \bigcup_{g \in G} g(A)$ which implies $A \in \sigma(S_\tau)$.

By the continuity of the action we know that

$$\tau \subset F.$$

We shall prove that F is a monotone class and that the σ-algebra generated by τ is the same as the monotone class generated by τ to conclude that $\mathcal{B} \subset F$.

To prove that F **is a monotone class** we notice that if $A_n \nearrow A$ we have $\bigcup_{g \in G} g(A_n) \nearrow \bigcup_{g \in G} g(A)$ by definition of increasing limit and if $A_n \searrow A$ then $\bigcup_{g \in G} g(A_n) \searrow \bigcup_{g \in G} g(A)$. The last fact follows from the general following fact.

$$A_n \searrow A \text{ and } B_n \searrow B \text{ implies } A_n \cup B_n \searrow A \cup B \tag{7.4}$$

This is a consequence of the following reasoning. If $A_n \searrow A$ and $B_n \searrow B$ we have that $A_n \cup B_n$ is decreasing. To see that $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A_n \cup B_n) = A \cup B$ we take $x \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A_n \cup B_n)$. So, by definition $x \in A_n \cup B_n$ for all n and then $x \in A_n$ for all n or $x \in B_n$ for all n. If not there would exist N_1 and N_2 such that $x \notin A_{N_1}$ and $x \notin B_{N_2}$, so $x \notin A_{\max(N_1,N_2)} \cup B_{\max(N_1,N_2)}$. We conclude that $x \in A$ or $x \in B$.

To see that **the monotone class generated by τ equals the σ-algebra generated by** τ we use the monotone class theorem. By this theorem it suffices to show that the algebra generated by τ is contained in the monotone class generated by τ.

We know that every closed set is a decreasing limit of open sets (if F is closed then $\{x \in X : d(x, F) < \frac{1}{n}\} \searrow F$ as $n \to \infty$). But the algebra generated by τ is the smallest family of sets closed under finite union and under finite intersection that contains the open and closed sets. We know that if $A_n \searrow A$ and $B_n \searrow B$ then $A_n \cap B_n \searrow A \cap B$ by definition of limit and we saw before in 7.4 that $A_n \cup B_n \searrow A \cup B$. So, the sets that can be written as a decreasing limit of open sets is closed under finite union and finite intersection.

This proves that every element of the algebra generated by τ is a decreasing limit of open sets and thus belongs to the monotone class generated by τ.

□

Now, to prove that w_n is measurable we can notice that w_n is measurable with respect to the quotient σ-algebra, i.e. the largest σ-algebra such that p is measurable. What we can get is that this σ-algebra is the Borel σ-algebra associated to the quotient topology.

Lemma 7.8 (Relation between quotient topology and quotient σ-algebra)**.** *As in Lemma 7.7, let (X, τ) be a metrizable topological space and G a finite group that acts continuously on X. Denote by $p : X \to X/G$ the canonical projection map and let $\bar{\tau}$ be the quotient topology on X/G. Denote by $\sigma(\bar{\tau})$ the Borel σ-algebra on $(X/G, \bar{\tau})$, i.e. the σ-algebra generated by $\bar{\tau}$. Consider also the quotient σ-algebra Q on X/G, i.e. $A \in Q$ if and only if $p^{-1}(A) \subset X$ is measurable. Then,*

$$\sigma(\bar{\tau}) = Q.$$

Proof of the lemma. We note that the application

$$P : 2^{X/G} \to 2^X$$

$$A \mapsto p^{-1}(A)$$

is injective due to the surjectivity of p. It is enough to prove that $P(\sigma(\bar{\tau})) = P(Q)$. We have that

$$P(\sigma(\bar{\tau})) = \sigma(P(\bar{\tau})) = \sigma(\{A \in \tau : \ \forall g \in G, \ g(A) = A\})$$

and

$$P(Q) = \{A \in \mathcal{B} : \ \forall g \in G, \ g(A) = A\}.$$

By Lemma 7.7,

$$\sigma(\{A \in \tau : \ \forall g \in G, \ g(A) = A\}) = \{A \in \mathcal{B} : \ \forall g \in G, \ g(A) = A\}$$

and we finish the proof.

□

Applying this lemma to $X = M^n$ and $G = S_n$ we complete the proof.

□

D Confining and lower limit properties of the entropy

In this appendix, instead of writing $d\mu(x)$ we shall write $\mu(dx)$.

Given a probability measure $\tau \in \mathcal{P}(M^n)$ we consider a random element $(X_1, ..., X_n)$ in M^n with law τ and an n-tuple of random probability measures $(\tau^1, \tau^2, ..., \tau^n)$ in $\mathcal{P}(M)^n$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tau^i}[f] = \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)|X_1, ..., X_{i-1}]$$

for every bounded measurable $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$. A construction of $(\tau^1, \tau^2, ..., \tau^n)$ can be made using transition kernels as in [18, Theorem 9.9.2]. To understand the behavior of $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ we will study the behavior of $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i$.

Proposition 7.9 (Chain rule)**.**

$$D(\tau \| \pi^{\otimes_n}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^n D(\tau^k \| \pi)\right].$$

Sketch of the proof. We will give an idea of the proof ignoring issues of measurability and finiteness of the entropy. For more details we refer to [11, Theorem C.3.1].

We shall define explicitly the random elements $(\tau^1, \tau^2, ..., \tau^n)$ in $\mathcal{P}(M)^n$ and $(X_1, ..., X_n)$ in M^n. The domain of our random variables will be M^n endowed with the probability measure τ. We define $X_k : M^n \to M$ as the projection onto the k-th coordinate. By definition the law of $(X_1, ..., X_n)$ is τ. Suppose $\tilde{\tau}^k : M^{k-1} \to \mathcal{P}(M)$ is a transition kernel from $(X_1, ..., X_{k-1})$ to X_k and define $\tau^k = \tilde{\tau}^k \circ p_{k-1}$, where $p_{k-1} : M^n \to M^{k-1}$ is the projection onto the first $k-1$ coordinates. We may notice that the case $k = 1$ is already treated in the previous definitions if we consider $M^0 = \{\emptyset\}$. For

instance, τ^1 is constant equal to $p_1(\tau)$. We can see that $(\tau^1, ..., \tau^n)$ satisfies the desired properties. If we assume all entropies are finite,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[D(\tau^k\|\pi)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[D(\tilde{\tau}^k \circ p_{k-1}\|\pi)\right] \\
&= \int_{M^n} D(\tilde{\tau}^k \circ p_{k-1}(x)\|\pi)\, \tau(dx) \\
&= \int_{M^{k-1}} D(\tilde{\tau}^k(x)\|\pi)\ \ p_{k-1}(\tau)(dx) \\
&= \int_{M^{k-1}} \left(\int_M \log\left(\frac{\tilde{\tau}^k(x,dy)}{\pi(dy)}\right)\tilde{\tau}^k(x,dy)\right)\ \ p_{k-1}(\tau)(dx) \\
&= \int_{M^{k-1}\times M} \log\left(\frac{\tilde{\tau}^k(x,dy)}{\pi(dy)}\right)\ \ p_k(\tau)(dx,dy)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $p_k(\tau)(dx,dy) = \tilde{\tau}^k(x,dy)\, p_{k-1}(\tau)(dx)$. Define $\tilde{\rho}_k : M^{k-1} \times M \to [0,\infty]$ by $\tilde{\rho}_k(x,y) = \frac{\tilde{\tau}^k(x,dy)}{\pi(dy)}$ and $\rho_k = \tilde{\rho}_k \circ p_k$. We get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D(\tau^k\|\pi)\right] = \int_{M^n} \log\left(\rho_k(z)\right)\tau(dz).$$

Then, summing over k we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^n D(\tau^k\|\pi)\right] = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[D(\tau^k\|\pi)\right] = \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{M^n} \log\left(\rho_k(z)\right)\tau(dz).$$

Finally we notice that

$$\Pi_{k=1}^n \rho_k(z) = \frac{\tau(dz)}{\pi^{\otimes_n}(dz)}$$

by definition of transition kernel and conclude the proof.

□

Proof of Lemma 3.3, the confining property of the entropy. We use the notation introduced at the beginning of this appendix and we shall not write the dependence on j for simplicity. By Proposition 7.9 and by the convexity of $D(\cdot\|\pi)$ (see [11, Lemma 1.4.3]) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i \middle\| \pi\right)\right] \le \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n D(\tau^i\|\pi)\right] = \frac{1}{n}D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n}).$$

Then, as the sequence $\frac{1}{n}D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n})$ is bounded from above we get that $\mathbb{E}\left[D\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i \middle\| \pi\right)\right]$ is also bounded from above. So, the sequence of laws of the random variables $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i$ is tight due to Proposition 7.4 in Appendix A and the fact that $D(\cdot\|\pi)$ has compact level sets (for the latter property see [11, Lemma 1.4.3 (c)]).

Now, to see that the sequence of laws of $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ is tight we notice that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i\right].$$

because

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\delta_{X_i}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\tau^i\right]$$

by definition of τ^i. Then we use the fact that the sequence of laws of random probability measures is tight if and only if the sequence of expected values is tight (see Appendix A , proposition 7.5 or [10, Lemma 10]). □

Now we want to prove Lemma 3.2, the *lower limit property of the entropy.* For this we will compare $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ and $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i$ and define a metric such that the distance between them converges to zero in probability. But first we take a bounded measurable function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ and compare its integral with respect to both probability measures.

Lemma 7.10 (Concentration inequality for a test function f)**.** *Let $(X_1, ..., X_n) \in M^n$ and $(\tau^1, ..., \tau^n) \in \mathcal{P}(M)^n$ be the random elements defined at the beginning of this appendix. Let $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded measurable function. Consider the random measures*

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$$

and

$$\hat{\tau} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\int_M f(x)\hat{\mu}(dx) - \int_M f(y)\hat{\tau}(dy)\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq 4\frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{n\epsilon^2}.$$

Proof. By Chebyshev's inequality, we need to understand

$$\text{var}\left(\int_M f(x)\hat{\mu}(dx) - \int_M f(y)\hat{\tau}(dy)\right).$$

The first term is

$$\int_M f(x)\hat{\mu}(dx) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n f(X_k)$$

and the second is

$$\int_M f(y)\hat{\tau}(dy) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n \int_M f(y)\,\tau^k(dy) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[f(X_k)|X_1, ..., X_{k-1}].$$

We can see that both have the same expected value and if $i < j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)|X_1, ..., X_{i-1}]\Big)\mathbb{E}[f(X_j)|X_1, ..., X_{j-1}]\Big]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)|X_1, ..., X_{i-1}]\Big)f(X_j)\Big]\end{aligned}$$

because $(f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)|X_1, ..., X_{i-1}])$ is $(X_1, ..., X_{j-1})$ measurable. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)|X_1, ..., X_{i-1}]\Big)\Big(f(X_j) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_j)|X_1, ..., X_{j-1}]\Big)\Big] = 0.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{var}\left(\int_M f(x)\hat{\mu}(dx) - \int_M f(y)\hat{\tau}(dy)\right) &= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[(f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_i)|X_1, ..., X_{i-1}])^2\right]\\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n 4\|f\|_\infty^2 = \frac{1}{n}4\|f\|_\infty^2\end{aligned}$$

and by Chebyshev's inequality we can complete the proof. ∎

Choose any sequence of bounded continuous functions $\{f_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ that determines probability measures (see Corollary 7.2 in Appendix A) and such that

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \|f_k\|_\infty^2 = 1.$$

Take a sequence of strictly positive numbers $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} a_k = 1$. Define the metric

$$d : \mathcal{P}(M) \times \mathcal{P}(M) \to \mathbb{R}$$
$$(\mu,\nu) \mapsto \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} a_k \left| \int_M f_k(x)\mu(dx) - \int_M f_k(y)\nu(dy) \right|$$

This metric induces the weak topology. We have the following corollary of Lemma 7.10.

Corollary 7.11 (Concentration inequality)**.** *With the same notation as Lemma 7.10 we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(d(\hat{\mu},\hat{\tau}) > \epsilon) \leq \frac{4}{n\epsilon^2}$$

Proof. We can notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(d(\hat{\mu},\hat{\tau}) > \epsilon) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} a_n \left| \int_M f_k(x)\hat{\mu}(dx) - \int_M f_k(y)\hat{\tau}(dy) \right| > \epsilon \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \left\{ \left| \int_M f_k(x)\hat{\mu}(dx) - \int_M f_k(y)\hat{\tau}(dy) \right| > \epsilon \right\} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \int_M f_k(x)\hat{\mu}(dx) - \int_M f_k(y)\hat{\tau}(dy) \right| > \epsilon \right) \\
&\leq 4 \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\|f_k\|_\infty^2}{n\epsilon^2} \leq \frac{4}{n\epsilon^2}
\end{aligned}$$

□

The previous corollary gives us a convergence in probability when n tends to infinity. This implies that if the law of $\hat{\mu}$ converges then the law of $\hat{\tau}$ converges to the same limit. With this idea we prove Lemma 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.2, the lower limit property of the entropy. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3 we do not write the dependence on j. By the convexity of $D(\cdot\|\pi)$ (see [11, Lemma 1.4.3]),

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i \middle\| \pi \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n D(\tau^i\|\pi) \right] = \frac{1}{n} D(\tau\|\pi^{\otimes_n}), \tag{7.5}$$

where we have used the *chain rule*, Proposition 7.9. As the law of $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ converges to ζ and as the distance between $d\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i\right)$ converges to zero in probability we get that the law of $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i$ also converges to ζ. By the semicontinuity of $D\left(\cdot\|\pi\right)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\zeta\left[D\left(\cdot\|\pi\right)\right] \leq \liminf \mathbb{E}\left[D\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tau^i \middle\| \pi \right) \right]$$

and we take the lower limit in 7.5 to complete the proof.

□

References

[1] Greg William Anderson, Alice Guionnet, Ofer Zeitouni. *An introduction to random matrices.* Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 118. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[2] Carlos Beltrán, Nuria Corral and Juan G. Criado del Rey. *Discrete and continuous Green energy on compact manifolds.*
`https://arxiv.org/pdf/1702.00864.pdf`

[3] Gérard Ben Arous and Ofer Zeitouni. *Large deviations from the circular law.*
ESAIM: Probability and Statistics, 1998, vol. 2, p. 123-134.

[4] Robert J. Berman. *Large deviations for Gibbs measures with singular Hamiltonians and emergence of Kähler-Einstein metrics.*
`https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.05422`

[5] Robert J. Berman. *Kähler-Einstein metrics emerging from free fermions and statistical mechanics.* Journal of High Energy Physics, 2011, no. 10, 106.

[6] Robert J. Berman. *On large deviations for Gibbs measures, mean energy and gamma-convergence.*
`https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.08219`

[7] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures.*
Second edition. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. New York, 1999.

[8] Jean-baptiste Castéras. *A mean field type flow part I: Compactness of solutions to a perturbed mean field type equation.*
Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 53: 1-2 (2015) 221-246.

[9] Djalil Chafaï, Nathael Gozlan, and Pierre-André Zitt. *First-order global asymptotics for confined particles with singular pair repulsion.*
The Annals of Applied Probability 2014, Vol. 24, No. 6, 2371–2413.

[10] Paul Dupuis. *Representations and weak convergence methods for the analysis and approximation of rare events.*
`http://www.dam.brown.edu/people/documents/Padova.pdf`

[11] Paul Dupuis, and Richard S. Ellis. *A Weak Convergence Approach to the Theory of Large Deviations.*
Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, New York, 1997.

[12] Paul Dupuis, Vaios Laschos, and Kavita Ramanan. *Large deviations for empirical measures generated by Gibbs measures with singular energy functionals.*
`http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06928`

[13] Adrien Hardy. *A note on large deviations for 2D Coulomb gas with weakly confining potential.*
Electronic Communications in Probability, 17 (2012), no. 19, 1–12.

[14] Fumio Hiai, and Dénes Petz. *A large deviation theorem for the empirical eigenvalue distribution of random unitary matrices.*
Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 36 (2000), no. 1, 71-85.

[15] Fumio Hiai, and Dénes Petz. *Logarithmic energy as an entropy functional.* Advances in differential equations and mathematical physics (Atlanta, GA, 1997), 205-221, Contemporary Math., 217, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998.

[16] Gregory Miermont. *Théorèmes limites et processus de Poisson. Notes de cours de M2. Orsay, 2011–2012.* `http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/gregory.miermont/thlim.pdf`

[17] Sylvia Serfaty. *Coulomb Gases and Ginzburg-Landau Vortices.* Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2015.

[18] Daniel W. Stroock. *Probability theory. An analytic view.* Second edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

[19] Thierry Aubin. *Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

Université Paris-Dauphine, PSL Research University, CNRS, CEREMADE, 75016 PARIS, FRANCE.

E-mail address: `garciazelada@ceremade.dauphine.fr`